Cam. d. 698. 5

A VIEW OF THE DISSERTATION UPON THE EPISTLES OF *PHALARIS*, *THEMISTOCLES*, &c.

Lately Publish'd by the Reverend Dr. *BENTLEY*.

ALSO

Of the Examination of that Dissertation by the Honourable Mr. *BOYLE*.

In order to the Manifesting the Incertitude of Heathen Chronology.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λόγον ἔνδοξον οὔτω οὔ μοι δοκῶ προήσεσθαι, χρονικοῖς τῖσι λεγομένοις κανόσιν, οὓς μυρίοι διορθοῦντες ἄχει σήμερον εἰς οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς, ὁμολογούμενον δύναντοι καταστῆσαι τὰς ἀντιλογίας. Plutarch in Vit. Solon.

LONDON:

Printed by *H. C.* for *John Jones*, at the *Dolphin* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1698.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

13-253

THE PREFACE.

IT is not my purpoſe to intermeddle in the Controverſie concerning the Epiſtles of Phalaris, Themiſtocles, Socrates *and* Euripides. *Whether they be genuine or no, I ſhall not trouble my ſelf to enquire; nor yet whether* Æſop *was ſuch a Monſter for Uglineſs as ſome make him, or whether the Fables that go under his Name are his, or whether we have any thing now Extant of* Æſop's *own Compoſing. I remember a Paſſage in* Quintilian Inſtit. Orat. l. 5. c. 11. Illæ quoque Fabulæ quæ etiamſi originem non ab Æſopo acceperunt (nam videtur earum primus auctor Heſiodus) nomine tamen Æſopi maxime celebrantur, *&c. By which it may ſeem that he was of Opinion that* Heſiod *was the firſt Author of the Fables, which bore* Æſop's *Name in his time. But I ſhall not interpoſe in any of theſe Controverſies;*

verſies; that which I deſign is (if I miſtake not) a Matter of much greater moment.

There are many that have ſet themſelves highly to Extol and Magnifie the ſtudy of Chronology, and ſeem to have thought that they could never exceed in their Encomiums of it. And it is not my purpoſe to rob it of its due Praiſes. So far as there are hopes of attaining any certainty in it, it is without doubt a very laudable Study; and therefore the acquainting our ſelves with Scripture Chronology is very neceſſary, and no leſs profitable than it is pleaſant and delightful. For whatſoever is plainly expreſs'd in Sacred Writ, relating to Chronology is no leſs certain, than it is that the Author of the Scripture is Truth it ſelf. Therefore when I ſpeak of the uncertainty of Chronology, I am to be underſtood of Heathen Chronology. I grant alſo that even that was of good uſe to Joſephus, Africanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Euſebius, *and other Ancients, for deſtroying the Heathens pretenſions to Antiquity.*

By this it appears, That I do not go about to diſſuade Men from all ſtudy of Chronology; but there are ſundry things which (I think) are greatly to be diſlik'd in many

many of our modern Chronographers, that I would have Men caution'd againſt. There are who cannot contend more earneſtly for the moſt neceſſary and fundamental Article of Religion, than they do for a Chronological Trifle. They cannot endure that any ſhould diſſent from them, and fall foul upon thoſe that do, treating them many times with very rude and unbecoming Language. There are alſo who will preſume to aſſign not only the Year, but the Month, yea, perhaps the very Day, in which ſuch or ſuch things were done; Qui horas & ſingula annotarunt momenta, cum de integris ſeculis nihil certi adfirmare potuerint, *as one ſaith. But that which is moſt to be lamented, is Men's Expence of ſo much time and pains in this Study, and after all, leaving their Reader as unſatisfi'd as they found him. Some have ſpent a great part of their Life in it (as appears by the large Volumes writ upon this Subject) and theſe Men of extraordinary Parts, great Learning and Diligence; ſo that they might have been ſerviceable both to the Age in which they liv'd, and to Poſterity, if they had ſet themſelves with the like Application to more uſeful Studies.*

Theſe are ſome of the things which I could not but diſlike in our modern Chro-

nologers, and a ſerious Reflection upon them hath made me often deſire, that ſome Perſon fit for ſo great a Work would make it his buſineſs to convince the World of the uncertainty of Chronology. But not hearing of any that did apply himſelf to ſo neceſſary a Work, I thought it not amiſs to lay hold of the Advantage offer'd me by the late Diſſertation upon the Epiſtles of Phalaris, Themiſtocles, *&c. wherein I found many Paſſages in which the Reverend and Learned Author doth plainly bear Teſtimony to the uncertainty of Heathen Chronology, and more which may be made uſe of in order to the manifeſting of it. If Men were fully ſatisfy'd of this, methinks there ſhould need no more to prevent their falling into the foremention'd Errors. We might hope that they would not contend ſo earneſtly, nor be ſo impatient of contradiction, in Matters in which they are convinc'd, that it is impoſſible to attain to any certainty; and that they would not throw away ſo many precious Hours in the Study of them, nor lay ſo much ſtreſs upon the Arguments that are built upon them, as many do. They would conſider that it is not eaſie to build certain Concluſions upon a ſandy Foundation. How little* Plutarch *was mov'd with Arguments drawn from Chronology, is apparent from thoſe Words of his, which I have*

Tran-

Tranſcrib'd in the Title Page; and alſo refer to in Part II. *when I enquire after the time of* Solon's *Death. If others had rely'd upon ſuch Arguments no more than* Plutarch *did, it is probable that the unhappy Controverſie about* Phalaris's *Epiſtles had never been ſtarted.*

The View of the Diſſertation was finiſh'd not long after it was Publiſh'd; but I reſolv'd to wait till I ſaw what Anſwer would be made to it, believing that I ſhould have more aſſiſtance from the Anſwer, than I have had from the Diſſertation it ſelf. And my Expectation was not fruſtrated; for I found that the Honourable the Author of the Examination, had not only more frequently, but alſo more plainly and directly born Teſtimony to the uncertainty of Chronology, than the Reverend Author of the Diſſertation had done. So that I am now apt to flatter my ſelf with the hope, that the Authority of two ſuch great Names will be of force effectually to perſuade Men, not to throw away ſo much time upon the Study of Chronology, nor to rely ſo much upon it, as ſome have done.

A

VIEW

OF THE

DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EPISTLES

OF

Phalaris, *Themiſtocles*, &c.

PART. I.

"THE Time of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny cannot be preciſely determined; ſo various and defective are the Accounts of thoſe that write of him. Thus the *Diſſert. p.* 14. Here

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

Here it is plainly acknowledg'd, That the Time of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny is uncertain, and the reaſon that is given, is, becauſe *The Accounts of thoſe that write of him are ſo various and defective.*

If then it appear, That the Accounts given by thoſe who write of the other Perſons mention'd in the *Diſſertation*, are no leſs various and defective, we may as firmly conclude that the Time of their Flouriſhing or Reign is uncertain. The ſame may be apply'd to the Cities ſpoken of in the *Diſſertation.*

" *Euſebius* ſets the beginning of it, " *Olymp.* 31. 2. *Phalaris apud Agrigentinos* " *Tyrannidem exercet*; and the end of it, " *Olymp.* 37. 2. *Phalaridis Tyrannis de-* " *ſtructa.* By which reckoning he go- " vern'd 28 Years. But St. *Hierome*, " out of ſome unknown Chronologer " (for that Note is not Extant in the " Greek of *Euſebius*) gives a different " time of his Reign, above 80 Years " later than the other, *Olymp.* 53. 3. or " as other Copies read it, 52. 2. *Phala-* " *ris Tyrannidem exercuit annos* 16. Which " is agreeable to *Suidas*, who places him " κατὰ τὴν νϛ ὀλυμπιάδα, about the 52 *Olym-* " *piad*, *Diſſert. p.* 14.

Here

Here the Doctor declares the uncertainty of the time of the beginning, continuance, and end of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny. It begun *Olymp.* 31. 2. according to *Euſebius*, but according to St. *Hierome*, *Olymp.* 53. 3. or (as other Copies have it) 52. 2. ſo that there is above 80 Years difference. It continu'd according to *Euſebius* 28 Years; according to St. *Hierome* only 16. It ended according to *Euſebius*, *Olymp.* 37. 2. according to St. *Hierome*, *Olymp.* 57. 3. Thus the Doctor.

But the time of *Phalaris*'s Government is ſtill more uncertain, becauſe the Copies of *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon* do here very much vary. It ſeems that the Copy which the Doctor follow'd ſets the beginning of it, *Olymp.* 31. 2. But other Copies ſet it, *Olymp.* 31. 4. *Vid. Edit. Pariſ.* A. D. 1512. *Edit. Baſil.* A. D. 1570, and *Edit. Pontaci.* A. D. 1604.

Likewiſe his Copy ſets the end of his Reign, *Olymp.* 37. 2. but in *Scaliger*'s Edition, *A. D.* 1606. it is ſet, *Olymp.* 38. 2. and *Pontacus*'s Edition, together with that at *Paris*, and that at *Baſil* placeth it, *Olymp.* 39. 3. So as to the later account of the Time of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny, which we have in *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon*, and which the Doctor aſcribes to St.

St. *Hierome*, his Copy refers it to *Olymp.* 53. 3. and yet he himſelf tells us, That other Copies place it, *Olymp.* 52. 2. as *Scaliger*'s Edition ſets it, *Olymp.* 53. 4. and the Edition at *Paris*, and that at *Baſil*, *Olymp.* 51. 4. From all this I may conclude, That it is moſt certainly true which the Doctor ſaith, that *The time of* Phalaris's *Tyranny cannot be preciſely determin'd.*

" *Steſichorus* was but 6 Years old at " that ſuppoſed time of *Phalaris*'s Death. " *Diſſert. p.* 15.

By *That ſuppoſed Time of* Phalaris's *Death*, the Doctor means, *Olymp.* 37. 2. ſo that the Authors whom the Doctor follow'd, make *Steſichorus* to have been 6 Years old at that time and no more. But according to *Suidas*'s account, he could not be of the Age of 6 Years at that time, for he ſays expreſly, That *Steſichorus* was born in that very *Olympiad*, *viz. Olym.* 37. And *Euſebius* ſeems not to agree very well either with the Doctor's Authors, or with *Suidas*. For he ſets *Steſichorus*'s Death, *Olymp.* 55. 1. and we are told by *Lucian*, in his *Macrobii*, That he liv'd to the Age of 85 Years, according to which account he

muſt

muſt be born, *Olymp.* 33. 4. and conſequently (not 6 only, but) 14 or 15 Years old at that ſuppos'd time of *Phalaris*'s Death. And we may here obſerve, That *Suidas* neither agrees with *Euſebius*, as to the time of *Steſichorus*'s Death, nor with *Lucian*, as to the Age to which he liv'd. For *Suidas* makes him to have died, *Olymp.* 56. (not *Olymp.* 55. 1. as *Euſebius*.) And whereas *Lucian* ſays, That he liv'd 85. Years, according to *Suidas* (who placeth his Birth, *Olymp.* 37. and his Death, *Olymp.* 56) he did not reach 80. Add hereto, That *Euſebius* makes him to have been famous, *Olymp.* 42. 1. at which time he was but 20 Years old (if he was that) acccording to *Suidas*'s account of him; but it is not probable that he ſhould be ſo fam'd a Poet at that Age. Tho' they that believe the relation of *Pliny*, *Nat. Hiſt. l.* 10. *c.* 29. That a Nightingal ſung in his Mouth when he was an Infant, may perhaps not think it ſtrange, that he ſhould be ſo celebrated a Poet ſo Young. But what ſhall we ſay to the *Marmor Arundel.* which according to Mr. *Selden*, refers *Steſichorus*, to *Olymp.* 73. 3.? Or to *Conon*, who *ap. Photium Cod.* 186. *Sect.* 42. makes him Contemporary to *Gelon*, of whom hereafter? If theſe ſpeak of the

the ſame *Steſichorus*, that *Euſebius* and *Suidas* do, there needs no more to manifeſt the uncertainty of *Steſichorus*'s Age at that ſuppos'd time of *Phalaris*'s Death, *i. e. Olymp.* 37. 3.

" *Ariſtotle* and *Jamblichus* make theſe " three to be Contemporaries; *Diſſert.* " *p.* 15.

The *Three*, of whom the Doctor ſpeaks this are, *Phalaris*, *Steſichorus* and *Pythagoras*. And it is true, that *Ariſtotle Rhetor. l.* 2. *c.* 21. makes *Steſichorus* to be Contemporary to *Phalaris*, and *Jamblichus* in the Life of *Pythagoras* ſhews, That he and *Phalaris* were Contemporaries. But if *Pythagoras* liv'd in the Time of *Numa*, he could not be Contemporary to the other Two, according to the account that is given of them. Now *Livy*, *l.* 1. *n.* 18. acquaints us that there were who gave out that *Numa* was *Pythagoras*'s Scholar; and *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſ. l.* 2. ſays, That there were many that had writ thus. I grant that theſe two celebrated Hiſtorians do not approve of that Opinion concerning the Time of *Pythagoras*'s Flouriſhing; but it ſhews however, that it was not certain then at what Time he Flouriſh'd,

as

as it is uncertain ſtill. Thoſe that agree that he was not ſo early as *Numa*'s Time, differ much among themſelves about the Time when he liv'd. *Livy* ſays, That he was in *Italy* when *Servius Tullius* Reign'd at *Rome*, but *Cicero Tuſcul. Quæſt. l.* 1. and *A. Gellius*, *l.* 17. *c.* 21. ſay, That he came into *Italy* in the Reign of *Tarquinius Superbus*. According to *Pliny*, *Nat. Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 8. he liv'd about *Olymp.* 42. according to *Dionyſ. Halicarn. l.* 2. after *Olymp.* 50. according to *Diog. Laertius*, in *Pythagoras*, about *Olymp* 60. according to *Clemens Alex.* (*Vid. Strom. l.* 1. *bis*) *Olymp.* 62. according to *Euſebius*, in *Edit. Pontaci item Pariſ.* and *Baſil*, *Olymp.* 63. 4. in *Scaliger*'s Edition, *Olymp.* 65. 1. *Plutarch* in *Numa*, bears Teſtimony to the uncertainty of the Time when *Pythagoras* flouriſh'd, and alſo to the incertitude of Chronology in general. For having acquainted us that ſome affirm'd that *Pythagoras* convers'd with *Numa*, but that others made him almoſt 5 Generations later, he adds, That 'tis difficult exactly to adjuſt the Times; τὰς μὲν ὖν χρόνους ἐξακριβῶσαι χαλεπὸν ἐστι, &c.

" *Alæſa* was firſt built by *Archonides*
" a *Sicilian*, *Olymp.* 94. 2. or, as others
" ſay, by the *Carthaginians* about two
" Years

" Years before *Diod. p.* 246. So that " here are above 120 Years ſlipt ſince " the lateſt Period of *Phalaris*, *Diſſert.* " *p.* 16.

Here we have two that bear Teſtimony to the uncertainty of the time when this City was built, *viz. Diodorus Sic.* and the Dr. *Diodorus* having ſaid, that *Archonides* built the City *Aleſa*, a little after adds, That ſome ſay that *Aleſa* was built by the *Carthaginians*, about the time that *Amilcas* made Peace with *Dionyſius*; now the ſame *Diodorus* ſpeaks of *Amilcas*'s making Peace with *Dionyſius*, *Olymp.* 93. 4.

" *Thericles*, the *Corinthian* Potter was " Contemporary with *Ariſtophanes* the " Comædian; *Athenæus*, *p.* 470.—— " *Thericles*, with the Cups that had " their Appellation from him, come a- " bove 120 Years after *Phalaris*'s Death. " *Diſſert. p.* 19.

Athenæus's Words are theſe, γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ Ἀριστοφάνην, which ſeem to leave it uncertain whether *Thericles* liv'd at the ſame time that *Ariſtophanes* did, or only in the Times near it. But let it be granted, that he liv'd at the ſame time

time that *Ariſtophanes* did, ſtill it will not be certain that he was above 120 Years after the Death of *Phalaris*. It muſt be confeſs'd that, if that was certainly true which *Suidas* hath concerning *Ariſtophanes*, that he liv'd, *Olymp.* 114. this would make ſomething towards the Proof of this, That *Thericles* was above 120 Years after *Phalaris*'s Death. But the Authority of *Diodorus Sic.* doth utterly deſtroy the certainty of this account of *Suidas*, for *l.* 12. he affirms, That *Ariſtophanes* was about the Age of *Pericles*, and withal, that *Pericles* died, *Olymp.* 87. 4. ſo that according to him, *Ariſtophanes* liv'd before *Olymp.* 87. 4. Yea, *Euſebius* makes him not only to have liv'd, but alſo to have been famous, *Olymp.* 85. 4. and ſo *Thericles* (if he was *Ariſtophanes*'s Contemporary, as the Doctor ſays that he was) might be famous for his Cups then or before. Whence it follows, that it cannot be certain, That *Thericles* was above 120 Years after the Death of *Phalaris*, for from *Olymp.* 57. 3. to *Olymp.* 85. 4. are not 120 Years.

" *Thucydides*, *l.* 6. *p.* 414. relates, That " at the Time of *Xerxes*'s Expedition " into *Greece* (which was, *Olymp.* 73.)

" *Anaxilaus*, King of *Rhegium*, beſieg'd
" *Zancle*, and took it, and call'd it *Meſ-*
" *ſana*, from the *Peleponneſian* City of
" that Name, the Place of his Nativity.
" The ſame ſays *Herodotus*, *l.* 6. *c.* 23.
" and agreeably to this Narrative, *Dio-*
" *dorus* ſets down the Death of *Anaxi-*
" *laus*, *Olymp.* 76. 1. when he had
" Reign'd 18 Years. *Pauſanias Meſſen.*
" *p.* 134. placeth this ſame *Anaxilaus* of
" *Rhegium* about 180 Years higher than
" they do, telling, That he aſſiſted the
" Refugees of *Meſſana*, in *Peleponneſus*,
" after the ſecond War with the *Spar-*
" *tans*, to take *Zancle* in *Sicily*; which
" thereupon was call'd *Meſſana*, *Olymp.* 29.
" Ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Ολυμπιάδος ἐπεχώρησε τῆς ἑνάτης
" καὶ εἰκοστῆς, ἣν Κύνις Λάκων τὸ δεύτερον ἐνίκα
" Μιλπάδης παρ' Αθηναίοις Ἄρχοντος.——The
" time of the *Meſſenian* War agrees with
" that Computation, and the ancient
" Catalogue of the *Olympionicæ* puts
" *Chionis*'s Victory at that very Year,
" Ολυμπὰς εἰκόστη ἐνάτη Κύνις Λάκων σάδιον. *Diſ-*
" *ſert. p.* 24, 25, 26.

Here are many Things very uncer-
tain, as 1ſt. It is uncertain whether
Xerxes's Expedition was *Olymp.* 73. for
according to *Euſebius*, *Xerxes* begun his
Reign, *Olymp.* 73. 3. and if he came not
to

to the Empire till that time, it is manifeſt, as by the account given by others, ſo by the relation of *Herodotus*, that his Expedition into *Greece* was not *Olymp.* 73. For *Herodotus* ſays, *l.* 7. *c.* 7. That in the ſecond Year after the Death of his Father *Darius*, he made an Expedition into *Egypt* to reduce it, and *c.* 20. that having done this, he ſpent Four Years compleat in Preparation for the War againſt *Greece*, and ſet forward in the Fifth Year. I know that there are conſiderable Writers who do not agree with *Herodotus*, as to the Time that was taken up in Preparation againſt *Greece* (*Diodorus Sic. l.* 11. making it but Three Years, *Juſtin. l.* 2. *c.* 10. affirming, That he ſpent Five Years in it, which number of Years, *Julian Orat.* 1. *in laudem Conſtantii*, doubles, making it to have taken up Ten Years) but this only renders it more uncertain in what Year *Xerxes*'s Expedition into *Greece* was: To return to *Euſebius*, he ſets his Reduction of *Egypt*, *Olymp.* 74. 1. and his making a Bridge over the *Helleſpont*, *Olymp.* 74. 4. (*Vid. Edit. Pariſ. & Baſil. & Pontaci*) *Diodorus Sic. l.* 11. refers the Expedition into *Greece* to the Year following, *Olymp.* 75. 1. with whom *Dionyſ. Halicarn. l.* 9. agrees, as

the *Marmor Arund.* according to Mr. *Selden*, and others agrees with *Euſebius*, for they make the *An.* 217. to which the Marble refers *Xerxes*'s making a Bridge over the *Helleſpont*, to anſwer to *Olymp.* 74. 4. *Clemens Alex. Stro.* 1. ſets this Expedition 297 Years after the firſt *Olympiad*, as *Thucydides*, *l.* 1. placeth it in the Tenth Year after the Battle at *Marathon*, ſo that if that Battle was, *Olymp.* 72. 1. (as *Euſebius* ſets it) *Xerxes*'s coming againſt *Greece*, was *Olymp.* 74. 3. But *Plato de Legibus*, *l.* 3. ſays, That it was but *almoſt* Ten Years between *Datis*'s coming into *Greece*, and the Fight at *Salamis*. It muſt then be confeſs'd, that it is not certain in what Year *Xerxes*'s Expedition into *Greece* was, nor yet that it was, *Olymp.* 73. as the Doctor ſets it, unleſs *Olymp.* 73. be the Printers Miſtake.

2dly. It is uncertain when *Anaxilaus* Reign'd, and when *Zancle* was call'd *Meſſana*. For the Doctor acquaints us, That *Pauſanias* is ſo far from agreeing with *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, and *Diodorus Sic.* about the time of *Anaxilaus*, and of his changing the Name of that City, that their Accounts differ about 180 Years. It may perhaps be ſaid, That if the three other eminent Hiſtorians plainly

plainly agree upon the Time, *Pauſanias*'s Diſſent will not make it leſs certain; for we may conclude that it was his Miſtake. The Queſtion then will be whether *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, and *Diodorus Sic.* do plainly agree about the Time. And I ſhall grant that *Herodotus*, and *Diodorus Sic.* ſeem to agree as to the time of *Anaxilas*, or *Anaxilaus*, or *Anaxileos*, (for the Name is written thus differently,) *Herodotus*, *l.* 6. *c.* 23, 24. ſignifying that he Reign'd in the Time of *Darius*, the Father of *Xerxes*, and *Diodorus Sic.* ſaying, That having Reign'd 18 Years, he died *Olymp.* 76. 1. But of his changing the Name of *Zancle* into *Meſſana*, *Diodorus* in that place hath not a Word, and tho' *lib.* 4. he doth mention the change of the Name, yet there he doth not tell us either when, or by whom it was changed. *Herodotus*, *lib.* 7. *c.* 164. ſpeaks of the change of the Name from *Zancle* to *Meſſene*, as *Euſtathius* upon *Dionyſ. Alex.* alſo doth, alledging *Herodotus*; but they do not mention *Anaxilaus* as the Author of the Change, nor inform us when that Change was made. I grant that *Herodotus* ſpeaks of it upon occaſion of his mentioning one *Cadmus*, who liv'd at the time of *Xerxes*'s Expedition againſt *Greece*; but he does not

ſay that the Change was made then; yea, he ſeems to ſignifie that *Zancle* had chang'd its Name before: His Words are ἐς Μεσσήνην μεταβαλόντων, *which had chang'd its Name to* Meſſene. To come to *Thucydides*, *Herodotus* and he ſeem not to agree very well in that which they ſay of the King of *Rhegium*. By the perſuaſion of *Herodotus*'s *Anaxileos*, the *Samians* poſſeſs'd themſelves of *Zancle*, but *Thucydides*'s *Anaxilas*, caſt the *Samians* out of it, not long after that the *Samians* had driven the *Sicilians* out of it; ſo that perhaps it may be queſtion'd, whether thoſe two Hiſtorians ſpeak of one and the ſame Perſon. Beſides, tho' the Doctor ſays, That *Thucydides*, *l.* 6. *p.* 414. *relates, that at the time of* Xerxes's *Expedition into* Greece, Anaxilaus *took* Zancle, *and call'd it* Meſſana; yet the truth is, That *Thucydides* doth not there make any mention of *Xerxes*'s Expedition. He tells, That the *Samians* who had driven the *Sicilians* out of *Zancle, fled from the* Medes, but we cannot infer hence, that the Name of that City was chang'd at the time of *Xerxes*'s Expedition into *Greece*, much leſs that *Thucydides* relates it. The Concluſion is, That *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, and *Diodorus Sic.* leave us uncertain as to the Time of

of *Zancle*'s changing its Name, and *Pauſanias*'s Teſtimony alledg'd by the Doctor ſeems to make the Matter ſtill more uncertain.

3dly. It is not certain, that *Chionis* was Victor, *Olymp.* 29. tho' *Pauſanias* doth affirm poſitively that he was; for in the Ολυμπάδων ἀναγραφὴ, in *Scaliger* we read, thus, ΟΛ. ΚΘ Ξενοφῶν ὁ Κορίνθιος ἐνίκησεν· ὡς δέ τινες ἄλλοι, Κίονις Λάκων τὸ δεύτερον. Where we ſee that it is left doubtful, ſome ſaid that *Xenophon*, others, that *Chionis* was then Victor. But of this ſee more in Part 2d.

" Some *Sicilians* planted themſelves, " *Olymp.* 96. 1. upon an Hill call'd *Tau-* " *rus*, near the Ruins of *Naxos*, and " built a new Town there, which they " call'd *Tauromenion*, ἀπὸ τῆς ταύρου καὶ μένειν, " from their Settlement upon *Taurus*; " ſo *Diodorus*, *l.* 14. *p.* 282, and 305. " About 40 Years after this, *Olymp.* 105. " 3. one *Andromachus a Tauromenite*, ga- " ther'd all the remnant of the old *Nax-* " *ians*, that were diſpers'd through *Si-* " *cily*, and perſuaded them to fix there; " *Id. l.* 15. *p.* 411. *Diſſert. p.* 31.

The Doctor having ſaid, That *Andromachus perſuaded the* Naxians *to fix*

there, ſhould have added that which follows in *Diodorus Sic. viz.* That having ſtay'd a long time there, he call'd it *Tauromenium*, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ Ταύρῳ μονῆς. If the Doctor had not conceal'd this, it would have appear'd how uncertain it is, both when, and by whom the Name *Tauromenium* was given, and alſo that *Diodorus Sic.* bears Teſtimony to this incertitude, ſince *l.* 14. he ſays, That the *Sicilians*, that planted themſelves there gave it that Name, *Olymp.* 96 1. and *l.* 15. that *Andromachus* gave it that Appellation, *Olymp.* 105. 3. I need not trouble my ſelf to enquire, how well *Diodorus Sic.* his Accounts of *Tauromenium* agree with *Strabo*'s, *l.* 6. who makes *Tauromenium* to have been a Colony of the *Zancleans*, and *Catana* of the *Naxians*; whereas *Diodorus Sic.* his later Account makes *Tauromenium* to have been inhabited by the *Naxians*.

" *Democritus* was too Young to
" know even *Pythagoras*, τὰ τῶν χεόνων
" μάχεται, ſays, *Diogenes* (*in Vit. Democ.*)
" and yet *Pythagoras* ſurviv'd *Phalaris*,
" nay, depos'd him, if we will believe
" his Scholars. *Diſſert. p.* 34.

Diogenes

Diogenes Laert. (in Vit. Democ.) ſeems to ſay (not that *Democritus* was too Young to know *Pythagoras*, but) that he was too Young to be his Hearer. But *Euſebius* makes *Democritus* to have been famous before *Pythagoras*'s Death, ſetting the Death of *Pythagoras*, *Olymp.* 70. 4. and *Democritus*'s being famous, *Olymp.* 69. 3. in *Edit. Pontaci item Pariſ.* and *Baſil*, *Olymp.* 70. 1. in *Scaliger*'s Edition. The truth is, he that enquires into the Birth, Age and Death of *Democritus*, will find the time of every one of them to be uncertain. As to his Birth, *Thraſyllas* ſets it, *Olymp.* 77. 3. but *Apollodorus*, *Olymp.* 80. as *Diogenes Laertius* teſtifies; and *Suidas* takes notice of this difference. I know that γέγονε, in *Diog. Laert.* and γεγονὼς, in *Suidas*, are rendred *Vixit*, but I tranſlate them *Natus fuit*, becauſe *Diog. Laert.* adds, That he was a Year Elder than *Socrates*, and he from *Apollodorus* tells us, That *Socrates* was born, *Olymp.* 77. 4. See him in *Socrate*. Whether we tranſlate it one way or the other, it is evident, that the account of the time either of his Birth, or when he liv'd and became famous is various, and ſo uncertain. As to his Age, *Hipparchus* in *Diog. Laert.* gives him 109 Years, *Lucian* in *Longævis*, and *Phlegon de Mirabilibus*

bilibus & Longævis, allow him but 104 Years; *Diodorus Sic.* contracts it to 90 Years. Laſtly, as to his Death, *Diodorus Sic. (ibid.)* ſets it *Olymp.* 94. 1. but *Euſebius* refers it to *Olymp.* 94. 4.

" *Simonides* was but Seven Years old,
" or as others ſay yet unborn, when
" *Phalaris* was kill'd, *Diſſert. p.* 34.

Here the Doctor plainly bears Teſtimony to the uncertainty of *Simonides*'s Age, acquainting us, that ſome ſay that he was but Seven Years old, others that he was unborn when *Phalaris* died. Whereto I add, That it is not certain that he was either but Seven Years old, or unborn at the time of *Phalaris*'s Death. In *Euſebius*, we have four different accounts of the Time when *Simonides* flouriſh'd. It is ſet firſt, *Olymp.* 28. 4. Secondly, *Olymp.* 55. afterward, *Olymp.* 60. or 34. laſtly, *Olymp.* 73. 3. Now if we follow the ſecond of theſe accounts which makes him to have flouriſh'd, *Olymp.* 55. 1. (in *Edit. Pontaci, item Pariſ.* and *Baſil,*) *Olymp.* 55. 2. (in *Scaliger*'s *Edit.*) it is ſo far from being true, that he was unborn, or but Seven Years old, that he was famous Nine or Ten Years before the time that the Doctor pitcheth upon for

for *Phalaris*'s being ſlain, *viz. Olymp.* 57. 3. And according to the firſt account he was famous above 100 Years ſooner. *Clemens Alex.* ſays, That *Simonides* liv'd κατ' Αρχίλοχον, and that *Archilochus* was known after *Olymp.* 20. *Suidas* refers him to *Olymp.* 56. and adds, That others place him *Olymp.* 62. There were more than one of that Name, which might be the cauſe of theſe ſo much differing Accounts. The *Marmor Arund.* takes notice of two *Simonides*'s, both Poets, and the one Grandfather to the other. The former it makes to have flouriſh'd *Olymp.* 72. 4. the latter, *Olymp.* 79. 3. according to Mr. *Selden*'s Computation.

From *Ariſtophanes*, the famous Grammarian, we know that *Euripides*'s *Philoctetes* was written, *Olymp.* 87. This alſo is uncertain, for tho' it is true, that *Ariſtophanes* the Grammarian in his Argument of *Euripides*'s *Medea* doth ſay, That *Medea*, *Philoctetes*, *&c.* were acted, *Olymp.* 87. yet others name his *Phæniſſæ*, *&c.* as having been acted then; ſo *Scaliger*'s Ολυμπιάδων ἀναγραφή, as alſo Scholiaſt. *Ariſtophan.*

" *Alceſtis*, the firſt Tragedy of *Theſ-*
" *pis*, was acted about the 61. *Olympiad*,
" which

" which is more than Twelve Years af-
" ter *Phalaris*'s Death; *Marm. Arund.*
" *Suidas* Θέσπις, *Dissert. p.* 40.

I shall not enquire whether *Alcestis* was *Thespis*'s first Play, it is not plainly affirm'd either in the *Marmor Arund.* or in *Suidas* that it was. *Suidas* doth not mention it, tho' he names other Plays of his: He says of *Thespis*, ἐδίδαξε ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης καὶ ξ' Ὀλυμπιάδος, but that *Alcestis* was acted then he hath, not a Word. The *Marm. Arund.* is so defective, that little or nothing can be made of it. Part of the Name which is suppos'd to be *Alcestis* is wanting, and likewise part of the *Archons* Name, yea, part of the number that should denote the Years, so that it is only by uncertain conjecture that some make the number of the Years to be 272 or 273, the *Archon* to be *Alcæus*, and the Play *Alcestis*. And whereas the *Marm. Arund.* speaks of an He-Goat being propos'd, *Eusebius* refers that to *Olymp.* 47. 2. between which and *Olymp.* 61. there is an interval of many Years. I add, That both *Plutarch* and *Diogenes Laert.* (in *Vit. Solon.*) testifie, That *Thespis* made Plays in *Solon*'s Time, and *Plutarch* adds, That *Solon* saw him Act; withal, he says, That ac-

cordin

cording to *Phanias*, *Solon* died when *Hegeſtratus* was *Archon*, *i. e.* (as ſome ſay) *Olymp.* 53. 4. but (as others) *Olymp.* 50. 2.

" *Thucydides*, *l.* 1. *p.* 90. and *Charon* " *Lampſacenus* ſay, That *Themiſtocles*, " when he fled into *Aſia*, made his Ad- " dreſs to *Artaxerxes*, who was newly " come to the Throne, wherein they " are follow'd by *Cornelius Nepos*, and " *Plutarch* (in *Vit. Themiſtoc.*) againſt " the common Tradition of *Ephorus*, " *Heraclides*, and moſt others, that " make *Xerxes* the Father then alive. " *Diſſert. p.* 80.

Here the Doctor bears Teſtimony to the uncertainty of the Time of *Themiſtocles*'s coming to the *Perſian* Court, and long before him we have *Plutarch*, and *Cornelius Nepos* witneſſing it. *Plutarch* writes, That *Ephorus*, *Dinon*, *Heraclides*, *Clitarchus*, and many more ſay, That *Themiſtocles* came to *Perſia* in the time of *Xerxes*, but that *Charon Lampſacenus* agrees with *Thucydides*; affirming, That *Themiſtocles* came in the Reign of *Artaxerxes*. And when the ſaid *Plutarch* comes to give his own Opinion, he only ſays, That *Thucydides* ſeems to agree better with

with the Annals or Chronicles, and he judg'd thoſe Chronicles not to be exact, ἐν' ἀυτοῖς χρόνοις ἀτρέμα συνταρτομένοις, ſo he. As to *Cornelius Nepos*, I grant that he thought that we ſhould believe *Thucydides* rather than the other; but he, withal, teſtifies, That the moſt were againſt *Thucydides*. If the incertitude of the Time of *Themiſtocles*'s coming to the *Perſian* Court was not ſufficiently prov'd already, it might be made more apparent from the diſagreement of other Eminent Perſons about it. For tho' *Diodorus Sic. l.* 11. and *Valerius Maximus*, *l.* 8. *c.* 7. together with *Euſebius*, refer it to the time of *Xerxes*, yet *Cicero ad Atticum*, *l.* 10. *epiſt.* 7. following *Thucydides*, refers it to the time of *Artaxerxes*, *Non vidit quid Artaxerxi polliceretur*; ſo he.

" *Hiero* was come to the Crown ſome
" Years before *Themiſtocles*'s Baniſhment
" and Voyage to *Corcyra*. 'Tis true,
" the Chronology of this part of Hiſto-
" ry is not ſo ſetled and agreed, as to
" amount to a Demonſtration againſt
" the Letters; but however, when
" join'd with the Arguments preceding,
" at leaſt it will come up to a high Pro-
" bability. *Theophraſtus* in his Treatiſe
" of Monarchy, (*ap. Plutarch Themiſt.*
" *p.* 225.)

" *p.* 225.) relates, That when *Hiero* had
" ſent Race-horſes, and a moſt ſumptu-
" ous Tent to the *Olympian* Games; *The-*
" *miſtocles* advis'd the *Greeks* to plunder
" the Tyrants Tents, (τὴν νεάνιν) and not
" to let his Horſes run. 'Tis evident
" then, if *Theophraſtus* ſpeak properly,
" that *Hiero* was Monarch of *Syracuſe*,
" when *Themiſtocles* was at *Olympia*;
" but it is moſt certain he never came
" thither after his Exile. But to deal
" fairly, it muſt be confeſs'd that *Ælian*
" (*Var. Hiſt.* 9. 5.) in telling this Story va-
" ries from *Theophraſtus*; for he ſays
" *Hiero* himſelf came to the Games: But
" that he would go thither in Perſon
" after he got the Government is whol-
" ly improbable. So that if *Ælian* be
" to be believ'd, this Buſineſs muſt have
" been done before *Hiero* came to the
" Throne. For even in *Gelo*'s Life-
" time, who left him the Monarchy,
" he kept Horſes for the Race, and won
" at the *Pythian* Games. *Pythiad* the 26.
" (*Pind. Schol. Pyth.* 1. and 3.) which an-
" ſwers to *Olymp.* 74. 3. But beſides,
" that *Theophraſtus* is of much greater
" Authority, the other refutes himſelf
" in the very next Words. For he ſays,
" That *Themiſtocles* hindred *Hiero* on
" this pretence, That *he that did not*
" *ſhare*

" *ſhare in the common Danger, ought not*
" *to ſhare in the common Feſtival:* Where
" its certain by the *common Danger*, he
" means *Xerxes*'s Expedition, when *Gelo*
" either refus'd or delay'd to give the
" *Grecians* his Aſſiſtance: This Affront
" then was put upon *Hiero*, after that
" Expedition. But the very next *Olymp.*
" after *Hiero* was in the Monarchy,
" *Diod.* 11. *p.* 29. Beſides theſe Inferen-
" ces and Deductions, we have the ex-
" preſs Verdict and Declaration of moſt
" of the Chronologers (*Schol. Pind.*
" *Pyth. Diod.* 11. *p.* 29, 41. *Euſeb.* in
" *Chron.*) who place the beginning of
" *Hiero*'s Reign, *Olymp.* 75. 3. and *The-*
" *miſtocles*'s Baniſhment ſeven Years af-
" ter, *Olymp.* 77. 2. The *Arundelian*
" Marble indeed differs from all theſe
" in the Periods of *Gelo* and *Hiero*,
" which would quite confound all this
" Argumentation from the Notes of
" Time. But either that Chronologer
" is quite out, or we can ſafely believe
" nothing of Hiſtory. For he makes
" *Gelo* firſt invade the Government two
" Years after *Xerxes*'s Expedition. But
" *Herodotus* ſpends half a dozen Pages
" in the account of an Embaſſy to *Gelo*,
" from *Sparta* and *Athens*, to deſire his
" Aſſiſtance againſt the *Perſian*. And

" 'tis

" 'tis agreed among all, That *Gelo*'s " Victory over the *Carthaginians* in *Si-* " *cily*, was got the very ſame Day with " the Battle at *Salamis*; *Herodot. l.* 7. " and *Diod. l.* 11. *Diſſert. p.* 83, 84, 85, " 86.

It is here plainly acknowledg'd, That the Chronology of this part of Hiſtory which concerns *Themiſtocles* and *Hiero*, is not clearly ſetled and agreed. And not only ſo, but the Doctor in his Margin alſo ſets down the Words of *Plutarch* in *Themiſt.* wherein that Great Man plainly declares, That the Annals or Chronicles are not ſo exact, that they can be depended upon, ὡς αὐτοῖς χρόνοις ἀτρέμα συνταττομένοις.

The Doctor moreover confirms the Truth of that Obſervation, That the Chronology of this Part of Hiſtory is not clearly agreed. For Firſt, he ſays, That *Theophraſtus*, if he ſpeak properly, makes *Hiero* Monarch of *Syracuſe*, at that time when *Themiſtocles* advis'd the *Grecians* not to permit his Horſes to run at the *Olympian* Games. Whereas (ſays he) if *Ælian* be to be believ'd, this Buſineſs muſt have been done before *Hiero* came to the Crown. Secondly, he ſays,

That the *Arundelian* Marble differs from all thoſe whom he had nam'd, (*viz. Scholiaſt. Pindar. Diodorus Sic.* and *Euſebius*) in the Periods of *Gelo* and *Hiero.* The Doctor perceiving that it was not very eaſie to looſe theſe two Knots reſolv'd to cut them, by diminiſhing the Authority of *Ælian*, and the *Arundelian* Marble, and going about to prove that the former refutes himſelf, of which Attempt of the Doctors I ſhall only ſay, That I humbly conceive that he hath undertaken a difficult Task.

We have ſeen how plainly the Doctor doth acknowledge, that this part of Chronology is not clearly ſetled and agreed, and yet there are ſome Paſſages in him that ſeem to ſay, That it is at leaſt pretty well adjuſted and agreed. As,

Firſt, He ſays, That *we have the expreſs Verdict and Declaration of moſt of the Chronologers, who place the beginning of* Hiero's *Reign*, Olymp. 75. 3. *and* Themiſtocles's *Baniſhment Seven Years after* Olymp. 77. 2. But we may obſerve, Firſt, That he only ſays, That we have the Verdict *of moſt of the Chronologers*, he doth not ſay *of all.* Secondly, Tho' he

he ſay *of moſt of the Chronologers,* he names only three, *Schol. Pind. Pyth.* 1. *Diod.* 11. *p.* 29, 41. *Euſeb.* in *Chron.* And as to the firſt of theſe, the Scholiaſt. upon *Pindar,* he *Pyth.* 1. places the beginning of *Hiero*'s Reign, τῇ ὀγδοηκοστῇ πεμπτῇ Ολυμπιάδι, in *Olymp.* 85. not 75. Poſſibly ſome bold Critick will tell us, That 85 is by the Scribes or Printers miſtake put for 75, but ſtill it will not well agree with that which the ſame Scholiaſt hath, *Pyth.* 3. where he makes *Hiero* to begin his Reign, κατὰ τὴν ἑβδομηκοστὴν Ολυμπιάδα. As to the time of *Themiſtocles*'s Baniſhment, I have not found that the Scholiaſt gives any account of it. *Diodorus Sic.* is the next, and it is true that he ſpeaks of *Hiero*'s beginning his Reign in *Olymp.* 75. 3. and of *Themiſtocles*'s Baniſhment in *Olymp.* 2. but we may obſerve, That he ſpeaks of *Themiſtocles*'s Death in the ſame Year, *viz. Olymp.* 77. 2. whereas it is clear that his Baniſhment and Death could not be in the ſame Year; and therefore from *Diodorus*'s mentioning *Themiſtocles*'s Exile in that Year, we cannot conclude that it was his meaning, that it was the very Year of his being Baniſh'd. In that Year *Diodorus* gives an account as of *Themiſtocles*'s Baniſhment, ſo alſo of his

going to *Argos*, his Flight from thence to *Admetus*, and afterward from *Admetus* into *Asia*, his Journey from thence to the *Persian* Court, and what befel him there, and lastly of his Death. Not that all these happen'd within the space of one Year (for there was a considerable time from his Banishment to his coming to the *Persian* Court, and a considerable time again from his coming thither to his Death,) but the Historian thought it best to dispatch all that concern'd *Themistocles*'s Fall at once. *Eusebius*'s *Chronicon* only remains, in which it is left uncertain whether the beginning of *Hiero*'s Reign is to be refer'd to *Olymp.* 75. or *Olymp.* 76. We read first *Hieron Syracusis regnat, Olymp.* 75. 3. and presently after *Hieron post Gelonem Sycusis Tyrannidem exercet, Olymp.* 76. 2. As to *Themistocles*'s Banishment it is not mention'd in the *Chronicon*, tho' his Flight to the *Persians* is. And if it were true, that according to *Diodorus Sic.* his Banishment was *Olymp.* 77. 2. it must be confess'd, that *Eusebius* differs very much from him, who sets his Flight to the *Persians, Olymp.* 76. 4. whereas his Banishment was a considerable time before it, as we have seen from *Diodorus Sic.* already; and it may appear further from

from *Thucydides*, *l.* 1. who informs us, That his living ſome time at *Argos*, and going into other Parts of *Peloponneſus*, his flying thence to *Corcyra*, and thence to King *Admetus*, and from him to *Aſia*, did all intervene between his Baniſhment and Flight into *Perſia*. By this which hath been ſaid it may be judg'd, whether we have the expreſs Verdict and Declaration of moſt of the Chronologers, that *Hiero* begun his Reign, *Olymp.* 75. 3. and that *Themiſtocles* was Baniſh'd *Olymp.* 77. 2.

Secondly, The Doctor ſays, That *it is agreed among all, that* Gelo's *Victory over the* Carthaginians *in* Sicily, *was got the very ſame day with the Battle at* Salamis. But tho' he ſaith *among all*, he only names *Herodotus*, and *Diodorus Sic.* And *Herodotus*, *l.* 7. *c.* 166. only ſays, That it was reported, λέγωσι ὡς, *&c. They ſay, that* Gelo's *Victory over the* Carthaginians *was the ſame Day with the Victory over the* Perſian *at* Salamis; ſo he.

And as to *Diodorus Sic.* he is ſo far from agreeing to this, that he ſays, That *Gelo* overcame on the ſame Day that *Leonides* fought *Xerxes* at *Thermopylæ*, συνέζη τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν Γέλωνα νικῆσαι καὶ τὸς

περὶ Θερμοπύλας μετὰ Λεωνίδου διαγωνίσασθαι πρὸς Ξέρξην; ſo *Diodorus*, *l.* 11.

Concerning this *Gelo*, I may obſerve, That the accounts of the Time both of the beginning and continuance of his Government are ſo various, that we cannot think it ſtrange that it is ſo uncertain, when his Succeſſor *Hiero* came to the Crown. As to the beginning of *Gelo*'s Government (not to take notice of the *Marmor Arund.*) according to *Pauſanias Eliac Poſt.* he begun to Reign *Olymp.* 72. 2. with whom *Dionyſ. Halicarn.* partly agrees, who, *l.* 7. ſpeaking of an Embaſſy which was in that Year, ſays, That *Gelo* was then newly come to the Government; but *Euſebius* ſets the beginning of his Reign, *Olymp.* 73. 2. and according to *Diodorus Sic.* it begun *Olymp.* 73. 4. As to the continuance of it, *Scaliger*'s Greek *Euſebius* ſays, That he Reign'd 17 Years, and yet the Time of *Hiero*'s ſucceeding him is there ſet, ſo that he Reign'd but Twelve Years. The Latin *Euſebius*, according to one account gives him Twelve Years, according to another only Nine: *Ariſtotle* in *Polit. l.* 5. *c.* 12. allows him Seven, and ſomething more: *Gelo* (ſays he) *Reign'd Seven Years, and dy'd in his Eighth Year.* Finally, *Diodorus Sic. l.* 11. allows him only Seven Years. " *Diodorus*

" *Diodorus*, who hath brought all his " Hiſtory into the method of Annals, " places the Death of *Pauſanias Olymp.* " 75. 4. and the Exile of *Themiſtocles* Six " Years after, *Olymp.* 77. 2.——*Plu-* " *tarch* in *Themiſt. p.* 224. makes *Themi-* " *ſtocles* after his Baniſhment to have " private Dealings with *Pauſanias. Diſ-* " *ſert. p.* 87, 88.

If the Doctor have rightly repreſented theſe two Eminent Hiſtoriographers, we have here a clear confirmation of that which I have lately inculcated, *viz.* the Incertitude of the Time of *Themiſtocles*'s Baniſhment, for it was before the Death of *Pauſanias*, according to the one, Six Years after it according to the other. And it will not be eaſie to reconcile them, unleſs we ſhall ſay, That *Themiſtocles* had Dealings with *Pauſanias*, when *Pau-* *ſanias* had been dead Six Years.

" *Athenæus*, *l.* 11. *p.* 505. among o- " ther Errors in Chronology, for which " he chaſtiſes *Plato*, brings this in for " one, that he introduces *Phædrus* Diſ- " courſing with *Socrates*, who muſt cer- " tainly be dead before the Days of that " Philoſopher. *Diſſert. p.* 93.

If *Athenæus* do juſtly chaſtiſe *Plato* for Errors in Chronology, this alone may ſeem to be a ſufficient Demonſtration of the Incertitude of it. For if *Plato* could and did err in the Chronology of his own Time, or that which was near it, how can we give Credit to the account that we meet with in any Heathen Chronographers of things done long before their Time? Now the Inſtances which *Athenæus* 9. gives of *Plato*'s erring, are in Things of his own Time, or not much remote from it, as any one that will conſult him may ſee, both in the Place alledg'd by the Doctor, *viz. l.* 11. *p.* 505. and in *l.* 5. *p.* 217. where *Athenæus* ſays, ὅτι δὲ πολλὰ ὁ Πλάτων παρὰ τὰς χρόνους ἁμαρτάνει δῆλον ἐστὶν ἐκ πολλῶν. We may content our ſelves with the Inſtance produc'd here by the Doctor of *Phædrus* and *Socrates*. That *Socrates* was in *Plato*'s Time will be readily granted, and if *Phædrus* was *Plato*'s Scholar, (as ſome Learned Men make him to have been) he was in his (*i. e. Plato*'s) Time alſo. But it will be ſaid, This cannot be, for the Doctor informs us, That *Phædrus* was certainly Dead before the Days of *Socrates*. To which I anſwer, that it is true, That the Doctor tells us ſo; but *Athenæus* ſays no ſuch thing.

Athenæus's

Athenæus's Words are theſe, ἀδύνατον δὲ καὶ φαίδρον κατὰ Σωκράτην εἶναι, ſo that here is nothing of *Phædrus*'s being Dead: But *Athenæus*'s meaning might be, That he was not born in the Time of *Socrates*, or at leaſt too young to Diſcourſe with him in ſuch ſort.

I cannot but take notice, That *Macrobius Saturnal. l.* 1. *c.* 1. Tranſcribes ſome of thoſe Inſtances which *Athenæus* doth, but is not ſevere upon *Plato* as *Athenæus* is. *Socrate ita Parmenides antiquior, ut hujus pueritia vix illius apprehenderit ſenectutem, & tamen inter illos de rebus arduis diſputatur. Paralus vero & Xanthippus quibus Pericles pater fuit, cum Protagora apud Platonem diſſerunt ſecundo adventu Athenis morante, quos multo ante infamis illa peſtilentia Athenis abſumpſerat.* Thus *Macrobius*. They that pleaſe may ſee what *Ariſtides Platonica* 2da hath to the ſame purpoſe.

" Among the reſt that writ Elegies " and Encomiums on *Gryllus*, the Son " of *Xenophon*, *Hermippus* ſays, *Socrates* " was one, *Laert.* in *Xenophon*. Which is " a Blunder of no leſs then *Thirty Seven* " Years, the interval between *Socrates*'s " Death, and the Battle of *Mantinea*.

" *Socrates*

" *Socrates* was put to Death, *Olymp.* 95. 1.
" when *Laches* was Magiſtrate. This
" is univerſally acknowledg'd: See *Dio-*
" *dorus*, *Favorinus*, *Diog. Laert. Ariſti-*
" *des*, *Marmor Arund. Euſeb. Argument.*
" *Iſocrat. Buſir.* &c. *Diſſert. p.* 99.

I do not find, that it is univerſally acknowledg'd, that *Socrates* died *Olymp.* 95. 1. *Suidas* ſays, That he was born *Olymp.* 77. and liv'd 80 Years, according to which account he died *Olymp.* 97. The *Chronicon Alexand.* makes him to have died *Olymp.* 104. 1. about which Time the Battle of *Mantinea* was according to the Doctor. Even ſome of theſe whom the Doctor here alledges for his being put to Death, *Olymp.* 95. 1. do not acknowledge it. *Euſebius* in *Edit. Pariſ.* and *Baſil.* with *Pontacus*'s, ſets his Death *Olymp.* 95. 3. in *Scaliger*'s Edition, *Olymp.* 95. 2. The *Marmor Arund.* (if Mr. *Selden* computes right) ſets it *Olymp.* 94. 4. In *Argument. Buſir. ap. Iſocrat.* 'tis only ſaid that *Socrates* died *Laches* being *Archon*, there is no mention of *Olymp.* 95. 1. The ſame may be ſaid of *Ariſtides.* There are then only two of all theſe whom the Doctor names, that ſay plainly that he died *Olymp.* 95. 1. As to *Hermippus*, he doth not ſay that *Socrates* writ

an

an Encomium of *Gryllus* being Dead, he only ſays in general, that he writ an Encomium of him, which he might do while *Gryllus* was living.

" We have it from good Hands (*Diog.*
" *Laert.* in *Socrate*, *Argum. Iſocrat. Buſir.*)
" that *Euripides*, in a Play of his, call'd
" *Palameaes*, uſing theſe Words, Ἐκάνεν'
" ἐκάνεν τὸν πάνσοφον, *&c.* deſign'd to laſh
" the *Athenians* for *Socrates*'s Murther,
" and the whole Theatre perceiving it
" burſt into Tears. *Socrates* therefore
" died before *Euripides*. But 'tis well
" known that the later died Six Years
" before *Laches* was *Archon*. *Diſſert.*
" *p.* 100.

The Doctor might well infer from that which *Diogenes Laert.* affirms, touching *Euripides* laſhing the *Athenians* for the Murther of *Socrates*, that (if he really did ſo) *Socrates* was Murther'd before the Death of *Euripides*. And yet *Philochorus* in the ſame *Diogenes Laertius* ſays the quite contrary, That *Euripides* died before *Socrates*. Muſt we not then conclude that there is no certain *Conſtat* whether of them died ſooner? But the Doctor ſays, That *Euripides* died Six Years before *Laches* was *Archon*, and ſo Six

Six Years before *Socrates*, who died in the Time of *Laches*'s Magiſtracy. To which I anſwer, Firſt, The uncertainty of the Time of *Socrates*'s Death hath been already manifeſted. Secondly, It is not certain that *Euripides* died Six Years before *Laches* was *Archon*. If *Laches* was *Archon Olymp.* 95. 1. (as the Doctor makes him to have been) according to *Euſebius*, *Euripides* died above Six Years before his Magiſtracy, for he ſets his Death *Olymp.* 92. 4. and the *Marmor Arund.* (according to Mr. *Selden*'s computation) agrees with *Euſebius*. But the *Chronicon Alex.* differs from them both, placing *Euripides*'s Death *Olymp.* 94. 3. (not 6, but) only Two Years before *Laches*'s being *Archon*, ſuppoſing that to have been *Olymp.* 95. 1. *Diodorus Sic. l.* 13. ſaying, That *Apollodorus* ſets the Death of *Euripides Olymp.* 93. 3. (Six Years before *Laches*'s being *Archon*) and withal, That others make him to have dy'd a little before thoſe Times, plainly bears Teſtimony to the uncertainty of the time of his Death.

" *Palamedes* was acted *Olymp.* 91. 1.
" (*Ælian Var. Hiſt.* 2. 1. *Schol. Ariſtoph.*
" *p.* 401.) which is Sixteen Years before
" *Laches. Diſſert. p.* 100.

If

If *Palamedes* was acted after the Murther of *Socrates*, then it was not acted *Olymp.* 91. 1. unleſs we will ſay that *Socrates* dy'd before the time. But the Doctor ſays, That *we have it from good Hands, that* Euripides *in his* Palamedes *deſign'd to laſh the* Athenians *for* Socrates's *Murther*, and then it muſt be acted after it. And it cannot be prov'd either from *Ælian* or *Schol. Ariſtoph.* that *Palamedes* was acted *Olymp.* 91. 1. *Ælian* ſpeaks of *Palamedes* (not *l.* 2. *c.* 1. but) *l.* 2. *c.* 8. and as to the time of its being acted, his Words are κατὰ τὴν πρώτην καὶ ἑκατὴν Ολυμπάδα, of which nothing can be made; and the Latin hath *Olympiade prima ſupra octogeſimam.* The Scholiaſts Words are μήποτε δὲ παρεκρούσθη τὸν Εὐριπίδην Παλαμήδην ὑπὲρ πολλῶν διδάξαντα. But how it can be concluded from them that *Palamedes* was acted *Olymp.* 91. 1. I know not. So that until it can be made to appear from other Authors when it was acted, it muſt remain uncertain.

" According to moſt Chronologers, " *Euripides* was about Seventy, and by " the moſt favourable account above " Sixty, when *Archelaus* came to the " Crown. *Diſſert. p.* 131.

Here

Here the Doctor plainly declares the uncertainty of *Euripides*'s Age, when *Archelaus* came to the Crown, ſince according to him moſt Chronologers ſay, That he was about Seventy, but others only that he was above Sixty. Further we have no certainty as to the Time of *Archelaus*'s coming to the Crown. *Athenæus*, *l.* 5. *p.* 217. (the very Place alledg'd by the Doctor in his Margin) ſeems to ſay plainly, That it was in the Third Year of the *Peloponneſian* War, but *Euſebius* will have it to have been ſooner, *viz.* at the beginning of that War. And the time of the beginning of that War is not exactly agreed and ſetled. *Diodorus Sic. l.* 12. and the Ολυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴ refer it to *Olympiad* 87. 2. but *Euſebius* to *Olymp.* 87. 1. and not *Euſebius* only, but alſo *Thucydides*, who writes the Hiſtory of that War, for he makes it to have begun when *Pythodorus* was *Archon*, now he was *Archon Olymp.* 87. 1. according to *Diodorus Sic. l.* 12. and the Ολυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴ. *Pliny*, *l.* 30. *c.* 1. ſays, it begun *a trecenteſimo noſtræ urbis anno*, but *circa annum fere trecenteſimum viceſimum tertium*, ſays *A. Gellius*, *l.* 17. *c.* 21. Now if we follow either *Euſebius*'s or *Athenæus*'s account of the Time of *Archelaus*'s coming to the Crown, *Euripides* could

could not be at that time either about Seventy, or above Sixty Years of Age. According to *Diog. Laertius in Socrate*, *Euripides* was born *Olymp.* 75. 1. and according to *Euſebius*'s account, *Archelaus* came to the Throne *Olymp.* 87. 1. *viz.* Forty Eight Years after; ſo that as *Clemens Alex. Strom.* 1. ſays, That there were Forty Eight Years between *Xerxes*'s Paſſage into *Greece* (at which time *Euripides* is ſaid to have been born) and the beginning of the *Peloponneſian* War, ſo by this account, *Euripides* was only the Age of Forty Eight Years, at the beginning of *Archelaus*'s Reign. According to *Athenæus*'s account, *Archelaus* ſucceeded in the Kingdom when *Epameinon* was *Archon*, *i. e.* (according to the Ολυμπιάδων ἀναγραφή) *Olymp.* 87. 4. *Epaminondas* (who was *Archon Olymp.* 87. 4. according to *Diodorus Sic. l.* 12.) is believ'd to be the ſame with *Athenæus*'s *Epameinon.* Now from *Olymp.* 75. 1. (the Year of *Euripides*'s Birth) to *Olymp.* 87. 4. are no more than Fifty One Years, which are far ſhort of *about Seventy*, or *above Sixty.*

Notwithſtanding that the Doctor ſays, That *according to the moſt Chronologers*, Euripides *was about Seventy when* Archelaus *came to the Crown*, yet after all, in his

his Margin he only names *Diod. Sicul. & alios apud Athen. l.* 5. *p.* 217. But he had done well if he had directed us to the place in *Diod. Sicul.* where he gives this account of *Euripides*'s Age; for my part I despair of finding any such. And as to *Athenæus*, in all that *p.* 217. to which we are refer'd there is no mention of *Euripides*. I grant that there is an account of the time of *Archelaus*'s succeeding *Perdiccas*; but it is such as makes not for the Doctor's purpose, but wholly against him, as I have just now declar'd. And now that I name *Perdiccas*, what can make more toward the manifesting the uncertainty of Chronology, than that which *Athenæus* in that very place observes, touching the wonderful Discord that there is about the number of Years that *Perdiccas* Reign'd? *Nicomedes Acanthius* (says he) *gives him Forty One Years*, Theopompus *Thirty Five*, Anaximenes *Forty*, Hieronymus *Twenty Eight*, Marsyas *and* Philochorus *Twenty Three*: Thus *Athenæus*. The accounts of the Time that *Perdiccas* Reign'd being so various, it must be more difficult to assign the Time of *Archelaus*'s succeeding him.

I know

I know that a Learned Critick takes upon him to correct *Athenæus*, making him to ſet the Time of *Archelaus*'s coming to the Crown much later than it is in our Copies. But if this was ſo that he ſet it later, it would make the difference greater between *Euſebius* and him. Withal, I am not ſatisfy'd with this Criticks Correction or Alteration, for Firſt, I find that the Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴ agrees exactly with our Copies of *Athenæus*, placing the beginning of *Archelaus*'s Reign in the 3d Year of the *Peloponneſian* War, when *Epameinon* was *Archon*. Secondly, He doth not produce the Authority of any approved Copies to warrant his Alteration. Thirdly, He doth not alledge any ancient Hiſtorian, that ſays expreſly that *Archelaus* begun his Reign that Year which he pitcheth upon, *viz. Olymp.* 93. 3. He only infers this from the Words of *Diodorus Sic. l.* 14. whom he makes to ſay, That *Archelaus* dy'd *Olymp.* 95. 2. having Reign'd Seven Years; and if both theſe be true, that he Reign'd Seven Years and no more, and dy'd *Olymp.* 95. 2. the beginning of his

Reign muſt be placed *Olymp.* 93. 3. But not to take notice that this Critick miſtakes the Year of *Archelaus*'s Death (for *Diodorus Sic.* ſets it not *Olymp.* 95. 2. but 95. 1.) the ſame *Diodorus l.* 13. relates, That *Archelaus* King of the *Macedonians* beſieg'd *Pydna*, *Olymp.* 92. 3. therefore he was King then, and how long before that time we know not.

It appears then that there is no agreement, either as to the time how long *Perdiccas* Reign'd, or as to the time when *Archelaus* ſucceeded, or as to *Euripides*'s Age at the time of his ſucceeding, but they are all uncertain.

" *Planudes* lived about 2000 Years
" after *Æſop*. *Diſſert. p.* 149.

The Doctor doth well in uſing this cautious Expreſſion *About* 2000 *Years*, for unleſs we could be aſſur'd both when *Æſop*, and when *Planudes* lived, we cannot be certain how long the one lived after the other. The Doctor in his Margin (from good Authority without doubt) makes *Planudes* to have

have lived *A. D.* 1370. but others refer him to *A. D.* 1340. and have perhaps as good Authority for ſo doing. And as we are thus uncertain how long *Planudes* lived after Chriſt, ſo there is no certainty how long *Æſop* was before him. *Suidas* ſays, he was before *Pythagoras*, but *Heraclides de Politiis* makes him to have been famous at the Time when *Pythagoras* was. *Plutarch in Vit. Solon. & in ſeptem Sapientum convivio*, relates, That he was very much in the favour of King *Cræſus*, as alſo what paſs'd between *Solon* and him, when *Solon* had incurr'd *Cræſus*'s Diſpleaſure; but *Euſebius* will have him to have been ſlain before *Cræſus*'s coming to the Monarchy. For according to *Euſebius*, *Cræſus* came to the Crown *Olymp.* 54. 2. and *Æſop* was ſlain either *Olymp.* 54. 1. (for ſo *Scaliger*'s Edition hath it, and that account ſeems to be follow'd by *Suidas*) or *Olymp.* 53. 4. as it is in other Editions. And as to the Birth of Chriſt, he ſets it *Olymp.* 194. 3. ſo that according to him, *Æſop* dy'd not much above 560 Years before it. But if we follow *Plutarch*, we muſt place *Æſop*'s Death later, *viz.* in the time

of *Cræſus*'s Reign, and then there were not ſo many Years between it and our Savious's Birth; and if we follow thoſe Eminent Chronologers that will not allow that there were above 490 Years between the firſt Year of *Cyrus* and our Saviour's Death, we muſt ſtill diminiſh the number of Years from *Æſop*'s Death to the Birth of our Saviour, and ſay, That there were not compleat 500 Years from the one to the other. By this it appears, That there is not any certainty how long *Æſop* lived before Chriſt, any more than there is how long *Planudes* lived after him; but tho' we take the extream accounts, and ſuppoſe the one to have lived ſomewhat more than 560 Years before our Lord's Nativity, and the other 1370 Years after, yet the whole time will fall conſiderably ſhort of 2000 Years.

A View

A

VIEW

OF THE

EXAMINATION

OF THE

DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EPISTLES

OF

Phalaris, *Themiſtocles*, &c.

PART. II.

" ZAleucus we are ſure was a *Py-*
" *thagorean*, *Porph. in vita Pyth.*
" *p.* 15. and *Diod. Sic. l.* 12. *p.* 84.
" Thus Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 53.

If this be certain, we muſt confeſs that the Time both of the Maſter's and of the Scholar's flouriſhing is moſt uncertain. The Scholar *Zaleucus*, is by *Euſebius* in *Chron.* refer'd to *Olymp.* 29. yet the Maſter *Pythagoras*, is both by the ſame *Euſebius*, and by ſeveral other Authors placed much later. And there are others who make *Zaleucus* very ancient, as well as *Euſebius* doth, particularly *Clemens Alex. Strom.* 1. who writes, That *Zaleucus* was reported to be the firſt Lawgiver, and that he receiv'd his Laws from *Minerva*; the later of which he confirms by the Teſtimony of *Chamæleon*, *Heracleotes* and *Ariſtotle*: And I add, That *Valerius Maximus*, *l.* 1. *c.* 2. ſays the ſame, *Zaleucus ſub nomine Minervæ apud Locrenſes prudentiſſimus habitus eſt.* But it will not be an eaſie Task to reconcile this account to that of *Diog. Laertius in Vit. Pythagoræ*, who, tho' he ſays expreſly, That *Pythagoras* was *Zaleucus*'s Maſter, yet ſets *Pythagoras*'s flouriſhing as late as *Olymp.* 60. above 120 Years after the Time that his Scholar *Zaleucus* was ſo much celebrated

brated among the *Locrians* according to *Euſebius*.

" Inſtead of *Olymp.* 37. he means, " I ſuppoſe, *Olymp.* 38. as 'tis in *Eu-* " *ſebius*———I'll ſuppoſe 37 a falſe " Print. Thus Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 118.

When Dr. *Bentley*, *Diſſert. p.* 14. ſays, That according to *Euſebius*, *Phalaris*'s Tyranny ended *Olymp.* 37. Mr. *Boyle* is ſo Ingenuous as to ſuppoſe, That by the Printers Miſtake, *Olymp.* 37. is put for *Olymp.* 38. But when the ſame Honourable Perſon adds, That it is *Olymp.* 38. in *Euſebius*, it is manifeſt, That he follows *Scaliger*'s Edition of his Chronicle, for in other Editions, it is not *Olymp.* 38. but *Olymp.* 39. as in that of *Paris*, *A. D.* 1512. and that of *Baſil*, *A. D.* 1570. and *Pontacus*'s; ſo that it is altogether uncertain to what *Olympiad Euſebius* refers the end of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny, as it is likewiſe uncertain to what Year *Euſebius* refer'd the beginning of it, whether to *Olymp.* 31. 2. according to *Scaliger*'s Edition, or to *Olymp.* 31. 4. according to the other.

" Page 13th, he ſays, *Xerxes*'s Ex-
" pedition was *Olymp.* 73. Page 85th,
" he ſays, the very next *Olympiad* af-
" ter *Xerxes*'s Expedition, *Hiero* was
" in the Throne; and quotes *Diodo-*
" *rus* (11. *p.* 39.) for it: Where we
" read, That *Hiero* came to the
" Crown *Olymp.* 75. 3. Therefore
" here Dr. *Bentley* is of Opinion,
" That *Xerxes*'s Expedition was in
" the 74th *Olympiad.* And yet if *Dio-*
" *dorus* is to be believ'd, *Xerxes* Ex-
" pedition was neither in the 73d,
" nor 74th, but 75th *Olympiad.* Thus
" Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 119.

Here (if I miſtake not) are two falſe Prints, one in Mr. *Boyle*, another in Dr. *Bentley*. In Mr. *Boyle*, the Printer hath put Page 13 inſtead of Page 24, for it is in his *Diſſert. p.* 24. that Dr. *Bentley* ſpeaks of *Xerxes*'s Expedition. In Dr. *Bentley*, I conceive, That by the Printers fault, *Olymp.* 73. is put inſtead of *Olymp.* 75. I ſomewhat ſuſpected this before, but am now fully confirm'd in it by conſidering, Firſt, That I cannot meet with any Author that refers *Xerxes*'s Expedition to *Olymp.* 73. and then

Secondly,

Secondly, That the very ſame Hiſtorian, who is alledg'd by Dr. *Bentley*, *Diſſ. p.* 85. to prove that *Hiero* was in the Monarchy the very next *Olymp.* after *Xerxes*'s Expedition (*viz. Diod. Sic.*) placeth *Xerxes*'s Expedition *Olymp.* 75. Suppoſing then as I now do, That Dr. *Bentley* makes *Xerxes*'s Expedition to have been (not in the 73d, but) in the 75th *Olympiad*, then it is moſt true, That according to *Diod. Sic. Hiero* was in the Monarchy the very next *Olympiad* after it, *viz. Olymp.* 76. And it is to be obſerv'd, That Dr. *Bentley* here (*Diſſ. p.* 85.) doth not take *Olympiad* for the ſpace of Four Years, but for the time when the *Olympick* Games were celebrated; and if we underſtand it thus, *Hiero* according to *Diod. Sic.* was not in the Throne in any *Olympiad* before the 76th. To conclude this, from Dr. *Bentley*'s quoting *Diod. Sic.* I infer that his meaning is, That *Hiero* was in the Monarchy *Olymp.* 76th, and that being according to him the very next *Olympiad* after *Xerxes*'s Expedition, it follows that with *Diod. Sic.* he refers that Expedition to *Olymp.* 75. But then

then I have ſhew'd in the former part of this View, that there are who differ from *Diod. Sic.* as to the Time of it, and ſo nothing can be certainly concluded concerning it. I have ſhew'd there alſo, that it is uncertain when *Hiero* came to the Monarchy.

" He begins his Chronological " Obſervations with the *Æras* of " ſome Cities; a very ſlippery Foun- " dation to build an Argument up- " on: For all theſe Cities are ſo very " ancient, that it would puzzle a " good Chronologer to trace their " Originals. The olded Hiſtorians " now Extant had but very ſlender " Memoirs of thoſe Times, and ac- " cordingly we find their Accounts " ſo confus'd and contradictory, that " none ſhould pretend to draw De- " monſtrations from 'em. I hear the " famous Mr. *Dodwell* is now Print- " ing ſome Lectures at *Oxford*, in " which he ſhews how very obſcure " and uncertain the Hiſtories of thoſe " Ages are; and that from the con- " currence of thoſe rude Accounts he " meets with, he hath made it pro-

" bable

" bable, That *Phalaris* muſt be " brought much lower than even St. " *Hierome* places him —— I hear " Mr. *Dodwell* brings *Phalaris* down " to *Olymp.* 70. Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 120. and " 154.

Here Mr. *Boyle* bears Teſtimony ſo plainly and fully to the uncertainty of Chronology, that a clearer Evidence cannot be deſired. *Euſebius* ſets the beginning of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny, *Olymp.* 31. St. *Hierome* brings it down to *Olymp.* 52. or 53. Mr. *Dodwell* thinks it muſt be plac'd ſtill lower, *viz. Olymp.* 70.

" *Thucydides* ſays, That *Anaxilaus* " beat out the *Samians* from *Zancle*, " and call'd it *Meſſana*; but " fixes the Time of this Action " no otherwiſe than only by ſaying, " 'Twas *not long after the* Samians " *flying from the* Medes *poſſeſs'd it.* " Dr. *Bentley* calls this *Xerxes* Expedition, as if the *Medes* had never " made an incurſion upon *Greece*, till " the time of *Xerxes*. What *Herodotus* ſays, *l.* 6. is ſo far from being the ſame with *Thucydides*'s

" Story,

" Story, that it contradicts it; for he
" says, not that *Anaxilaus* expell'd
" the *Samians* from *Zancle*, but that
" he assisted 'em to take it. That
" *Anaxilaus* chang'd the name of
" *Zancle* into *Messana*, is agreed be-
" tween Dr. *Bentley* and me; the
" only Question is about the Date
" of this Change. *Thucydides* fixes
" upon no Date: *Diodorus* places the
" Death of one *Anaxilaus* in the
" 76th *Olympiad*, but does not say
" this was the *Anaxilaus* that nam'd
" *Messana*. *Herodotus* in the place
" cited, says nothing about the change
" of the Names, but tells a story of
" the *Samians* seizing *Zancle*, a lit-
" tle after *Miletus* was taken; and
" all the ground that we have from
" this Passage of *Herodotus*, to con-
" clude the change of the Name
" *Zancle* into *Messana*, to have hap-
" pen'd after this Time, is his calling
" the City *Zancle*, and not *Messana*
" throughout this Story: Which, I
" think, proves nothing more, than
" that the old Name was not yet so
" utterly abolish'd, but that it was
" call'd indifferently either *Zancle* or
" *Messana* still. So that hitherto we
" have

" have had no direct and poſitive Te-
" ſtimony about the Time of *Zancle*'s
" changing its Name. Mr. *Boyle*,
" *p.* 127, 128, 129.

All this manifeſtly declares how uncertain *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, and *Diodorus Sic.* leave us, as to the Time of the name *Zancle*, its being exchang'd for *Meſſana*; ſo that there is no need of making any Remarks upon it.

" *Pauſanias* is the only Author,
" that ſpeaks fully up to the Point:
" and he expreſly affirms this to have
" happen'd in the 29th *Olympiad*, and
" tells the ſtory with a great deal of
" Solemnity and Circumſtance.——
" Againſt an indirect and dubious
" Proof, built chiefly on a diſputable
" Paſſage in *Herodotus*, we have the
" expreſs and full and undoubted Au-
" thority of *Pauſanias*. Mr. *Boyle*,
" *p.* 129. and 131.

Tho' *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, and *Diod. Sic.* leave us uncertain as to the Time of the change of the Name, yet it ſeems in Mr. *Boyle*'s Judgment, we

we may rely upon the undoubted Authority of *Pauſanias*, and conclude certainly that it was *Olymp.* 29. But I crave leave to queſtion, whether we can rely ſo certainly upon *Pauſanias*'s Authority in this caſe. For, Firſt, Tho' *Thucydides* doth not fix the Time of the change of the Name any otherwiſe than by ſaying, That *it was not long after the* Samians *flying from the* Medes, *poſſeſs'd* Zancle: Yet this is ſufficient to make us doubt of *Pauſanias*'s Aſſertion, that it happen'd *Olymp.* 29. unleſs ſome Records can be produc'd, which may certifie us, That the *Medes* made any Incurſion upon *Greece* ſo early as before that *Olympiad.* Secondly, when *Herodotus*, *l.* 7. *c.* 165. mentions the change of the Name, he is ſpeaking of things done about the time of *Xerxes*'s Expedition; now is it not ſtrange that he ſhould ſpeak of it ſo late, if the change was made (as *Pauſanias* ſets it) *Olymp.* 29. *i. e.* about 180 Years before? Eſpecially when he had occaſion to ſpeak of *Zancle* before. Thirdly, Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 130. makes *Pauſanias* to differ from *Herodotus*, and to reject his Teſtimony concerning the

the Age of *Anaxilaus*; now if the Name was chang'd from *Zancle* to *Meſſana* in his Time (as they ſay it was) from their differing as to the Age in which *Anaxilaus* liv'd, it muſt follow, that they alſo differ'd as to the Time when the change of the Name was made. Now whatever *Pauſanias*'s Authority may be in other things, I queſtion whether it is ſuch, as that we can certainly rely upon him, when two ſuch Hiſtorians as *Herodotus* and *Thucydides* differ from him. I may add, That if *Diodorus Sic.* who places the Death of one *Anaxilaus Olymp.* 76. ſpeaks of the *Anaxilaus* that nam'd *Meſſana*, he alſo differs from *Pauſanias*.

" In the 29th *Olympiad*, when *Chi-*
" *onis* won the Prize the ſecond time.
" Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 129.

It is true, that *Pauſanias* in *Meſſenicis*, *p.* 134. hath theſe very Words, and yet afterward in the ſame Page he ſays, That *Xenophon* the *Corinthian* won the Prize in the 29th *Olympiad*; ſo that I know not how to reconcile him to himſelf, unleſs by putting

putting a difference between ἐπὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδ᾽ & τῆς ἐνάτης καὶ ὀγδοηκοστῆς, & κατὰ τὴν ἐνάτην Ὀλυμπιάδα καὶ ἐνενηκοστήν. He uſeth the former Words concerning *Chionis*, the later concerning *Xenophon*; and the later we muſt tranſlate (not *In*, but) *About the* 29*th* Olympiad. But then what is the meaning of *About the* 29*th* Olympiad? If it be ſaid that his meaning is, That *Xenophon* was Victor in the next *Olympiad* to it, *viz.* the 30th, I ask why did he not plainly ſay ſo? Beſides, *Pauſanias* in *Arcadicis*, *p.* 269. ſays (not that *Xenophon*, but) *Chionis* was Victor the third time in the 30th *Olympiad*. Here I might alſo obſerve, That *Pauſanias* agrees not with himſelf as to the Time when *Miltiades* was *Archon*. In *Meſſenicis*, *p.* 134. he ſays it was in the 29th *Olympiad*, in which *Chionis* won the Prize the 2d time; but in *Arcadicis*, *p.* 269. he ſays it was in the 2d Year of the 30th *Olympiad*, in which *Chionis* won it the 3d time.

" The moſt Eminent Chronologers, and Men beſt vers'd in theſe " Things, fall in with this account of " *Pauſanias*. *Ubbo Emmius* follows it " in

„ in his Hiſtory of ancient *Greece*, *l.* 1.
„ *p.* 18. *Lydiat*, in his Notes on the
„ *Chronicon Marmoreum*, *Joſ. Scaliger*,
„ in his Animadverſions upon *Euſe-*
„ *bius*, *p.* 27. and in his Ἀναγραφὴ
„ Ὀλυμπάδων; ſo does *Petavius* too,
„ *Rat. Temp. par.* 1. *p.* 38. and *Meur-*
„ *ſius Lect. Att. l.* 2. *c.* 23. Mr. *Boyle*,
„ *p.* 130, 131.

Such Eminent Chronologers following *Pauſanias*'s account of the time of the change of the Name from *Zancle* to *Meſſana*, ſome Perſons may be apt to look upon it as certain: But on the other ſide, I ſay, Firſt, Suppoſe it true, That they do all follow his account, yet if they do not alledge ſome other ancient Hiſtorian that agrees with it, it ſignifies little; for it depends upon *Pauſanias*'s ſole Authority ſtill. Secondly, It doth not appear that they follow it. *Ubbo Emmius*, in his firſt Book mentions *Meſſana*, but of the change of the Name from *Zancle* to *Meſſana* (as far as I perceive) he ſays nothing. In his 7th Book, he ſpeaks of the change of the Name, but is wholly ſilent as to the Time of it. I add, that in

his firſt Book he quotes *Pauſanias*, when he is ſpeaking of the *Arcades*, and the ſecond *Meſſenian* War; but certainly we cannot conclude hence, that he follow'd *Pauſanias*'s account of the Time, when the new Name *Meſſana* was given to the City, which was before call'd *Zancle*. *Scaliger* both in his Ammadverſions, *p. (mihi)* 21. and in his Ἀναγραφὴ Ολυμπάδων (if that be his) refers the change of the Name to *Olymp.* 30. not to *Olymp.* 29. as *Pauſanias* doth. *Petavius* agrees not either with *Pauſanias* or *Scaliger*, but as *Scaliger* fixes the Time latter than *Pauſanias*, ſo *Petavius* ſets it ſooner, *viz. Olymp.* 27. See him, *de Doctrina Temporum*, *l.* 13. and in *Rat. Temp. par.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 8. *Meurſius* is ſo far from agreeing with *Pauſanias*, that he plainly ſhews how little *Pauſanias* is at agreement with himſelf; and he takes upon him to correct *Pauſanias*, inſtead of following him. *Lydiat* only remains, and if by his Notes on the *Chronicon Marmoreum*, Mr. *Boyle* means the *Notæ Hiſtoricæ ad Chronicon Marmoreum*, I grant that he doth fall in with *Pauſanias*'s account. To conclude then, ſince none of theſe Modern

dern Chronologers (except *Lydiat*) do agree with *Pauſanias*, and ſince the ancient Hiſtorians, *Herodotus* and *Thucydides* do leſs agree with him, what certainty can we have as to the Time when the City had the new Name *Meſſana* given it?

" *Diodorus* in his 14th Book ſays, " That ſome *Sicilians* planted themſelves upon *Taurus*, and from their " ſettlement there, call'd the place " they built *Tauromenium*: In the " 16th Book he ſays, That about " Forty Years after this, *Andromachus* planted ſome of the old *Naxians* upon *Taurus*, and from his " long ſtay there, call'd the place " where he planted them *Tauromenium*. Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 132.

Here this Honourable Perſon obſerving, That *Diodorus plainly gives two different accounts of the Time when the place was nam'd* Tauromenium, *and thoſe contradictory one to the other*, ſays enough to ſatisfie us of the Incertitude of it.

" There was a River *Tauromenius*
" (if *Vibius Sequeſter* is to be credited,
" who ſays the Town had its Name
" from thence) before there was a
" *Tauromenium*. Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 133.

Here the Time when the Town was firſt call'd *Tauromenium*, is made ſtill more uncertain; for if it had its name from the River *Tauromenius*, it might have it long before the former of the Times mention'd by *Diodorus Sic.*

" *Diomedes Grammaticus*, *l.* 3. the
" Scholiaſt. of *Ariſtophanes* in *Prole-*
" *gom.* and *Clemens Alexandrinus Stro.*
" 1. attribute the invention of Co-
" medy to *Suſarion*. But that he was
" not the inventer of it, the *Chroni-*
" *con Marmoreum* does more than in-
" timate, when it ſays only of him,
" That he firſt erected a Stage in
" *Athens*, to Act Comedies upon.
" Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 141.

All this tends directly to manifeſt the uncertainty of the Time when Comedy was invented. The Authority of *Clemens Alex.* with the other two,

two, affirming, That *Suſarion* was the inventer of it, is oppos'd to that of the *Marm. Arund.* which more than intimates, That it was invented before *Suſarion*, and attributes this only to him, That he erected a Stage at *Athens*, to Act Comedies upon. But then ſuppoſe it was certain, That it was not invented before *Suſarion*'s Time, and that he was the inventer of it, what certainty have we of the Time when *Suſarion* liv'd? All that Mr. *Boyle* can ſay of it, is, That according to the Marble, his erecting a Stage at *Athens muſt be before the Tyranny of* Piſiſtratus, and that *thoſe Learned Men, who have taken pains to illuſtrate that Chronicle, have by the concurrence of other Hiſtories plainly ſhewn, That the Time of* Suſario *muſt fall between the* 610*th and* 489*th Year before Chriſt.* Thus Mr. *Boyle, p.* 140, 141. But by the Printers fault 489 is put inſtead of 589. This will appear, if we conſult *Lydiat*'s Annotations upon the *Chronicon Marmoreum, Epoch.* 40. where his Words are *Suſarion innuitur claruiſſe inter annum*, 610. and 589. *ante Evangelium.* So that according to *Lydiat*, the *Marm. Arund.*

makes *Susarion* to have flouriſh'd between the 610th, and 589th Year (not before Chriſt, but) before the Goſpel, *i. e.* before the Time of the firſt Preaching, or Publiſhing of the Goſpel. In the *Notæ Hiſtoricæ ad Chronicon Marmoreum, Epoch.* 40. we read thus, *Susarionem inter Olympiadem* 50. and 540. *floruiſſe indicat mutilum Marmor*; but 540. is by the fault of the Preſs inſtead of ſomething elſe, perhaps inſtead of 54. for as Mr. *Selden* computes the *Marm. Arund.* ſets *Susarion* between *Olymp.* 49. 3. and *Olymp.* 54. 4. All this while *Susarion*'s Time is made to depend upon the ſole Authority of the *Marm. Arund.* if there be Learned Men, who have by the concurrence of other Hiſtories plainly ſhewn, That the Time of *Susario* muſt fall between the Years which *Lydiat* mentions: As Mr. *Boyle* doth not tell us who they are, ſo I have not ſeen them.

" If there are ſeveral material Cir-
" cumſtances that diſparage this one
" Witneſs's Teſtimony; if he liv'd
" at a great diſtance from the Time
" he writes of; if he ſpeaks by re-
" port

" port and hearſay only, without " vouching any Authority; if he ex- " preſſes himſelf, ſo that we have " room to doubt, whether we know " his Mind; or ſhould we know his " Mind, yet if he contradicts himſelf " immediately afterward: I ſay, if " theſe things appear againſt him, " then this one Witneſs is ſo far from " being as good as a Multitude, that " he is as good as none. Mr. *Boyle*, " *p.* 148.

Mr. *Boyle* ſays all this of *Athenæus*, and both in this, and in the ſix Pages following, makes it his Buſineſs to Demonſtrate, how little credit is to be given to his Teſtimony concerning the Age in which *Thericles* liv'd, and to which we owe the invention of the *Thericlean* Cup; ſo that more needs not be ſaid to manifeſt the uncertainty of it.

" *Solon* was *Archon Olymp.* 46. 3. " Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 166.

Diog. Laertius alledged by Mr. *Boyle* in his Margin, ſays, That *Solon* was *Archon Olymp.* 46. 3. if we may be-

lieve *Soſicrates*, τοῦτο φησὶ Σωσικράτης. *Soſicrates* is follow'd alſo in the Ολυμπάδων ἀναγραφή. But what ſhall we ſay then to *Tatianus Orat. con. Græcos in fin.* who makes *Solon* to have been *Archon* about the 40th *Olympiad*, and to *A. Gellius*, who makes him to have writ his Laws about the 49th *Olympiad*? Now as *Diog. Laertius in Solon.* obſerves, He writ his Laws when he was *Archon*. The Words of *A. Gellius*, *l.* 17. *c.* 21. are theſe, *Solonem accepimus, unum ex illo nobili numero Sapientum, leges ſcripſiſſe Athenienſium Tarquinio Priſco Romæ regnante anno regni ejus triceſimo & tertio.* Now if *Tarquinius Priſcus* begun his Reign *Olymp.* 41. 2. (as *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus*, *l.* 3. ſays he did) his 33d Year muſt be *Olymp.* 49. 3. Mr. *Boyle*'s Margin tells us, That *Euſebius in his* Chronicon *puts* Solon's Archonſhip *a Year later than* Olymp. 46. 3. but he ſhould rather have ſaid, That he ſets it a Year ſooner, for ſo it is in all the Editions of his *Chronicon* that I have ſeen.

" *Solon* dy'd at the end of the 53d, " or the beginning of the 54th *Olym-* " *piad*; *Plut. Vit. Sol.* Mr. *Boyle. p.* 166.

Plutarch

Plutarch only ſays, That according to *Phanias*, *Solon* dy'd when *Hegeſtratus* was *Archon*, and there is no Conſtat as to the Year in which he was *Archon*. Some ſay in the firſt Year of the 55th *Olympiad*, others in the fourth Year of the 53d, others in the ſecond Year of the 50th *Olympiad*. *Diog. Laertius* gives us an Epiſtle from *Solon* to *Cræſus*, and it is apparent, That it was writ after that *Cræſus* came to the Kingdom. In it, *Solon* tells *Cræſus*, That he would come to him, which he accordingly did; not immediately after his writing that Letter, but from *Athens* he went to *Ægypt*, thence to *Cyprus*, and thence to *Cræſus*, with whom he remain'd ſome time. Thence he went to *Cilicia*, and at laſt dy'd in *Cyprus*; Thus *Laertius*. By all which it appears, That *Solon*'s Death was long after *Cræſus*'s coming to the Throne, and therefore if *Cræſus* did not come to it till *Olymp.* 54. 2. (as *Euſebius* hath it) *Solon* muſt have liv'd long after *Olymp.* 53. or 54. And this is confirm'd by the Teſtimony of *Theophilus ad Autolycum*, who makes *Solon* to have liv'd in the Time of *Cyrus* and *Darius*, and according

according to *Euſebius*, the beginning of *Cyrus*'s Reign was not till *Olymp.* 55. 1. But we need go no further than *Plutarch* the Author here quoted, who ſays indeed, That *Phanias* makes *Solon* not to have liv'd two Years after the beginning of *Piſiſtratus*'s Tyranny; but withal, tells us, That *Heraclides* reports that he liv'd συχνὸν χρόνον a long time after it. Can we deſire a clearer and more authentick Teſtimony of the uncertainty of the Time when *Solon* dy'd than this is? And here I cannot but take notice of another paſſage in the ſame Life of *Solon*, which ſhews how little Arguments drawn from Chronology did ſway with *Plutarch*. Some (as he tells us) would refute the Hiſtory of *Solon*'s converſing with *Cræſus*, τοῖς χρόνοις, by Arguments drawn from the conſideration of the Times; but (ſays he) their Chronological Canons (as they call them) will not perſuade me to reject ſo illuſtrious an Hiſtory, atteſted by ſo many Writers, and ſo agreeable to *Solon*'s Prudence, Magnanimity and Manners. Ἐγὼ δὲ λόγον ἔνδοξον ὄντα, καὶ τοσούτους μάρτυρας ἔχοντα, καὶ (ὃ μεῖζον ἐστι) πρέποντα τῷ Σόλωνος ἤθει, καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλοφροσύνης

φροσύνης καὶ σοφίας ἄξιον, ὃ μοὶ δοκῶ προήσεσθαι, χρονικοῖς τῆσι λεγομένοις κανόσιν, &c. So *Plutarch.*

" That *Pisistratus* siez'd the Go-
" vernment of *Athens* some Years be-
" fore *Solon*'s Death, Dr. *Bentley*, I
" dare say, will grant me: That he
" was turn'd out in, or rather before
" *Phalaris*'s Reign, he will not I hope
" deny me; because he has own'd it
" in Terms, *p.* 41. of his *Dissertation.*
" Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 167.

Whether Dr. *Bentley* will grant that *Pisistratus* siez'd the Government some Years before *Solon*'s Death I know not, but I am sure that they who are mov'd with the Authority of *Phanias ap. Plut. Vit. Sol.* will not grant it; for he says expresly, That the interval of Time between *Pisistratus*'s invading the Government, and the Death of *Solon* was less than two Years, (ἐλάττονα δυοῖν ἐτῶν) and therefore according to him, the one was not *some Years* before the other. It is true (as was lately observ'd) that according to *Heraclides ap. Plut.* the one was some Years, perhaps many Years before the other,

other, but this difference between *Heraclides* and *Phanias* only ſhews how uncertain it is, how long it was before *Solon*'s Death, that *Piſiſtratus*'s Tyranny began. *Phanias ap. Plut.* ſays, That *Piſiſtratus* ſiez'd the Government when *Comias* was *Archon*, and that *Solon* dy'd when his immediate Succeſſor *Hegeſtratus* was *Archon*; but it is not agreed in what Year either of them was *Archon*. Some refer *Comias*'s *Archonſhip* to *Olymp.* 53. 3. others to *Olymp.* 50. 1. in the *Marm. Arund.* it is refer'd to *Olymp.* 54. 4. (if the Learned Men who have taken pains to illuſtrate that Marble, interpret it rightly) as it alſo makes *Piſiſtratus* to have begun his Tyranny then. But the Ὀλυμπιάδων Ἀναγραφὴ refers the Government of the *Piſiſtratidæ* or the Sons of *Piſiſtratus*, to *Olymp.* 50. 1. as both *Tatianus Orat. con. Græcos*, and *Clemens Alex. Stro.* 1. ſay, That the Time of their Government was *about the* 50*th* Olympiad: So that, if theſe be in the right, the Time of the Fathers ſiezing the Government muſt be ſet much higher. For *Juſtin, l.* 2. *c.* 8. ſays, That *Piſiſtratus* Reign'd 33 Years, with whom agrees *Heraclides*

clides de Politiis, and alſo *Ariſtotle de Republica*, *l.* 5. *c.* 12. if I dot not miſtake his meaning, when he ſays, That *in Thirty three Years* Piſiſtratus *Reign'd only Seventeen Years*, i. e. (if I underſtand him rightly) tho' there were Thirty three Years in all between *Piſiſtratus*'s invading the Tyranny and his Death, yet he enjoy'd it only Seventeen Years, the other Sixteen Years he liv'd in Exile. After all, I freely confeſs, That, if it could be made out, that the Word *Piſiſtratidæ* is not always uſed ſtrictly as it denotes the Sons of *Piſiſtratus*, but ſometimes in a more comprehenſive Senſe, as including *Piſiſtratus* and his Sons too, this Argument from the Authority of *Tatianus*, and *Clemens Alex.* would loſe all its force: But till that be made appear, it plainly Demonſtrates how little certainty there is of the Time when *Piſiſtratus* firſt ſeiz'd the Government. Nor is it more certain when he was turn'd out of it. Dr. *Bentley*, *Diſſ. p.* 41. ſays, It was in the Days of *Phalaris*, but Mr. *Boyle* will have it rather to have been before *Phalaris*'s Reign; both which accounts leave us uncertain when he was

was driven out, unleſs it could be certainly known what time *Phalaris* Reign'd. Beſides *Herodotus*, *l.* 1. *c.* 5. informs us, That *Piſiſtratus* was driven out twice, and as often recover'd the Tyranny; therefore we ſhould have been inform'd of whether turning out they ſpeak, otherwiſe we cannot ſo well judge of the Time of it.

" It is not to be doubted, but the " *Alceſtis* of *Phrynichus* (that *Phryni-* " *chus*, who was *Theſpis*'s Scholar) " was acted before *Olymp.* 67. Mr. *Boyle*, " *p.* 168.

But (craving this Honourable Perſons leave) I cannot but doubt of it, for as I know not that any Author affirms it, ſo he doth not declare what ground he hath for ſuch aſſurance. I know that *Suidas* affirms, That *Phrynichus* won the Prize in that very *Olympiad*, and mentions *Alceſtis* as one of his Plays; but it cannot be infer'd hence, That *Alceſtis* was acted before that *Olympiad*; Yea, if I ſhould ſay that it was one of thoſe Plays of his that were acted then, and by which he

he won the Prize, or that it was acted after that Time, it would not be eaſie to diſprove it.

" *Tragedy is of ancient Uſage in this* " *Country, nor did it take its Riſe from* " Theſpis *and* Phrynichus, *as ſome* " *imagine*; *but if you conſider the thing* " *well, you find that it is extreamly an-* " *cient*; Plato in Minoe. Mr. *Boyle*, " *p.* 170, 171.

Here *Plato* bears Teſtimony to the uncertainty of the Antiquity of Tragedy, in telling us his own Opinion, *viz.* That it is πάνυ παλαιὸν, very ancient, and yet withal, that others were of a contrary Opinion, that it took its Riſe from *Theſpis*. Beſides, he doth not tell us how ancient he believ'd Tragedy to be. I know Mr. *Boyle* ſays, That *he* (i. e. Plato) *thought it almoſt as ancient as* Minos, and that *the reaſon of his introducing the Reflection ſhews it*; but, if we conſult *Plato*, we ſhall find that the reaſon of his introducing it ſhews no ſuch thing. Whether *Plato* thought Tragedy more ancient than *Minos*, or only as ancient, or but almoſt as ancient, cannot be

be determin'd from the reaſon of his introducing the Reflection. Mr. *Boyle* knows not what to make of a Paſſage of *Plutarch*, in his Life of *Solon*, Ἀρχομένην πως περὶ Θέσπιν ἤδη τὴν Τραγῳδίαν κινεῖν, i. e. *Theſpis* now beginning to move or ſet on foot the Play called Tragedy; but (ſays he) *he could not mean, That there was no ſuch thing as Tragedy of any kind before the Days of* Theſpis, *and be conſiſtent with himſelf; for he expreſly tells us in another place (the Life of* Theſeus*) that the acting of Tragedies was one part of the funeral Solemnities which the* Athenians *perform'd at the Tomb of* Theſeus: Thus Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 176. But I do not find any ſuch thing in the Life of *Theſeus*. Indeed, in the Life of *Cimon*, there is a Paſſage which ſome Ignorant or leſs conſidering Perſons may poſſibly conſtrue to ſuch a Senſe, but Mr. *Boyle* could not. I add, that if there be any ſuch Paſſage in *Plutarch*, it doth not contradict this, That Tragedy took its Riſe from *Theſpis*, for *Theſeus* had no Tomb at *Athens*, before the Days of *Theſpis*. So that notwithſtanding any thing that Mr. *Boyle* alledges, *Plutarch* by thoſe Words in the

the Life of *Solon* might mean, That there was no ſuch thing as Tragedy of any kind before the Days of *Theſpis*. To proceed, Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 171. brings *Diog. Laertius* as a Witneſs, That Tragedy is more ancient than *Theſpis*; but on the other ſide, *p.* 177. he ſpeaks of Authors in the Plural Number, who make *Theſpis* the Inventer of it, and *p.* 176. he calls them old Writers; ſo that he acknowledges that there are ancient Writers for the one Opinion, as well as the other. I know that he would perſuade us, That when theſe Authors make *Theſpis* the Inventer of Tragedy, their meaning is, That he was the Improver of it, or that he was the Inventer of *that ſort of Tragedy which conſiſted in Imitation, and* a Fable, (See him, *p.* 174.) whereas there was Tragedy (tho' not of that ſort) before: But he himſelf is not very confident that this was their meaning, for he ſays, *p.* 177. *In this Senſe it is that we muſt underſtand thoſe Authors who make* Theſpis *the Inventer of Tragedy, or allow that they ſpake inconſiderately.* We are left (you ſee) to our liberty whether we will

underſtand thoſe Authors in the forementioned Senſe, or allow that they ſpake inconſiderately. But for my part, I am not forward to paſs ſuch a Cenſure upon ancient Writers, that they ſpake inconſiderately and unwarily, particularly I am not forward to believe either that *Clemens Alex.* ſpake inconſiderately, or that he ſpake of this or that ſort of Tragedy, but of it in general, when ſpeaking of the Inventers of other things he comes at length to Tragedy, and ſays, That *Theſpis* (ἐπενόησεν) devis'd or invented it. But it may be ſaid, If *Theſpis* was the Inventer of it, then the Date of Tragedy is not uncertain. To which I anſwer, That this would follow, if we were certain of the Time when *Theſpis* liv'd and flouriſh'd; but Mr. *Boyle* ſufficiently makes it appear how far we are from being certain of that. For *p.* 166. he ſays, That Plutarch *and* Diog. Laertius *expreſly affirm, That* Theſpis *was Contemporary with* Solon, *telling us very particularly what paſs'd between* Solon *and* Theſpis, *in relation to the Plays of the later*; and adds, That Solon *dy'd at the end of the* 53, *or the beginning of*

of the 54 Olympiad. In *p.* 167. he ſays, That *the* Arundel *Marble fixes the acting of* Alceſtis, *one of* Theſpis's *Plays as low as the 60th* Olympiad. And *p.* 170. he tells us, That *Suidas* ſays, *Theſpis flouriſh'd in the 61ſt* Olympiad. Mr. *Boyle* further tells us, That taking our account at the loweſt, we muſt make him to have written according to *Plutarch*, and *Diog. Laertius two or three Years before* Solon's *Death*; but we may take it higher, and make him to have begun to write Plays near the time of *Solon*'s *Archonſhip*, which according to Mr. *Boyle*, was *Olymp.* 46. 3. and we may the rather do this, becauſe *Euſebius Chronicon placeth the Riſe of Tragedy at the* 47*th* Olympiad, as Mr. *Boyle* obſerves, *p.* 166. Now between *Olymp.* 47. and *Olymp.* 61. are above Fifty Years. Thus it fully appears from the Authors alledg'd by Mr. *Boyle*, how little certainty we have of the time of the Riſe of Tragedy; thoſe that ſay it is more ancient than *Theſpis*, not aſcertaining us how much more ancient it is, and thoſe that make *Theſpis* the Inventer of it, not being agreed about the Time when he liv'd,

and begun to write Tragedies. Need I after all this take notice of that which *Suidas* hath to this purpoſe, acquainting us, That ſome make *Theſpis* the firſt Tragedian, but others *Epigenes Sicyonius*; ſome ſaying, That *Theſpis* was the 16th from *Epigenes*, and others that he was the 2d? An old Scholiaſt alledg'd by *Jul. Cæſar Bulenger de Theatro*, *l.* 1. *c.* 2. mentions one *Theomis*, who πρῶτος ἐξεῦρε, *&c.* firſt found out Tragical Melodies, and was admir'd for them among the *Grecians*, in the time of *Oreſtes* (they that pleaſe may ſee his Words either in *Bulenger*, or in the *Tractatus de Tragœdia*, prefix'd to the late *Cambridge* Edition of *Euripides*) but of what Authority that Scholiaſt is I know not.

" *Euſtathius*'s Time was about 200
" Years before *Planudes* was born.
" Mr. *Boyle*, *p.* 270.

Nicetas Choniat. Annal. l. 1. *verſ. fin.* makes *Euſtathius* to have liv'd in the Time of *Andronicus Commenus*, and he came to the Empire (as we are told) in or about *An. Do.* 1182. As

to

to *Planudes*, when he was born I know not, but as to the Time of his flouriſhing, Dr. *Bentley*, *p.* 149. placeth it *An. Do.* 1370. but other Learned Men ſet it *An. Do.* 1340. And it muſt be allow'd, That he was born at leaſt 20 Years before: And ſo according to one account, he was born at or before *An. Do.* 1320. according to the other, at or before *An. Do.* 1350. If then we make *Euſtathius* to have liv'd about *An. Do.* 1182. the interval between his Time, and the Birth of *Planudes* will fall conſiderably ſhort of 200 Years; ſo that the Account which Mr. *Boyle*'s Authors follow'd differs from theſe; but which is the trueſt cannot be determin'd.

Thus I have taken notice of moſt of the Paſſages in the *Diſſertation* and *Examination* of it which relate to Chronology, and conceive that with the aſſiſtance of the Learned and Worthy Perſons, the Authors of them, I have manifeſted the uncertainty of the Time, when the Perſons lived, or the Cities were built, or the Things were done, which are mention'd

tion'd in thoſe Paſſages. And we may believe that other parts of Heathen Chronology being ſtrictly examin'd, would be found to have no juſter pretenſions to Certainty, than theſe which have been now conſider'd are found to have.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Read [IN the Title-page, l. 18. πσι, and l. 19. blot out the Comma after ἀυτοῖς, and place it after σήμερον, p. 7. l. 27. χαλεπόν ἐσι, p. 8. l. 14. *Imilcas's*, p. 10. l. 19. Ἀρχοντ☉, p. 18. l. 21. 3 or 4. p. 20. l. 10. πρωτης, p. 22. l. 3. & p. 25. l. 16. χερνικοῖς, p. 22. l. 3. συνταξομένοις, p. 24. l. 14. *Ptol.* 1. *Diod.* p. 30. l. 1. Λεωνίδ☉, and ſtop in the ſame line thus, *& there ſet ſo, that*, p. 32. l. 11. blot out 9.] p. 37. l. 4. before that time, p. 64. l. 1. καθὰ φησι, [l. p. 67. l. 2. πσι, p. 71. l. 8. you will find.

Books Printed for John Jones, *at the* Dolphin *and* Crown *in St.* Paul's *Church-yard.*

PRactical Diſcourſes upon ſeveral Divine Subjects, *viz.* Of Religious Diſcourſe in Common Converſation. Of the Fear of Death. Concerning the Extent of Chriſt's Satisfaction. Concerning Practical Atheiſm. Of Walking by Faith. Concerning Charity to the Poor. Concerning the Right Uſe of the World. Concerning the Succeſſive Vanity of Human Life. An Admonition Concerning Two Late Books, Called *A Diſcourſe of the Love of God.* Vol. IV. Written by *John Norris*, M. A. Rector of *Bemerton* near *Sarum.*

Treatiſes upon ſeveral Subjects. *viz.* Reaſon and Religion, or the Grounds and Meaſures of Devotion. Reflections upon the Conduct of Human Life. The Charge of Schiſm continued.

Two

Two Treatiſes concerning Divine Light. Spiritual Counſel, or, The Fathers Advice to his Children. Written by *John Norris*, M. A. Rector of *Bemerton* in *Sarum*.

The Preſent State of the Univerſe, or an Account of I. The Riſe, Births, Names, Matches, Children, and near Allies of all the preſent Chief Princes of the World. II. Their Coats of Arms, Motto's, Devices, Liveries, Religions, and Languages. III. The Names of their Chief Towns, with ſome Computation of the Houſes and Inhabitants, their Chief Seats of Pleaſure, and other Remarkable things in their Dominions. IV. Their Revenues, Power and Strength. Alſo an Account of Common-Wealths, relating to the ſame Heads. The Second Edition much amended and enlarged, with the Addition of the Styles or Titles of the ſeveral Potentates and Republicks.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE